

8

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY,

AS SEEN

In the Light of Catholicism,

STATED AND DEFENDED BY

Rev. M. J. FERGUSON,

Professor of St. Michael's College, Toronto;

AND AS SEEN

IN THE LIGHT OF REVELATION,

EXAMINED AND EXHIBITED BY

WILLIAM A. STEPHENS,

Author of "Hamilton and other Poems and Lectures," &c.,
Owen Sound.

OWEN SOUND:

JOHN RUTHERFORD, GENERAL BOOK AND JOB PRINTER.

1871.

INTRODUCTION.

THE reason of this controversy was, as will be seen, a Lecture delivered according to announcement, by Father Ferguson, in the Town Hall, Owen Sound, which was reported in its main points, in the *Owen Sound Times* of February 10th, 1871. This was followed in the next number by a Letter from Mr. Stephens, in which he referred to the passage, "I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," and showed by a logical amplification of those words, what is claimed by the Pope in consequence of claiming possession of those Keys; and to this Letter was appended a copy of the *Curse of Excommunication* against Victor Emmanuel. The next paper (February 23rd) contained a poem under the caption, "How Peter used the Keys of the Kingdom;" and also, a Letter from Mr. G. Spencer, a late convert to Catholicism, in reply to Mr. Stephens' first Letter. The next *Times* (March 3rd) had Mr. Ferguson's first Letter in reply to Mr. Stephens. The next number (March 10th) contained Mr. Ferguson's second Letter, and Mr. Stephens' Letter in reply to Mr. Spencer; and in the following numbers of the *Times*, three Letters from Mr. Stephens, in reply to the two Letters from Mr. Ferguson, which ended the discussion, so far as it was published in that paper. But it was taken up editorially in the *Canadian Freeman* of Toronto, in two lengthy articles, which are given in this Pamphlet, as they are evidently from the pen of Mr. Ferguson. But before these articles had appeared, Mr. Stephens had continued his argument upon the general subject, which continuation is now published for the first time, as also his remarks upon those Editorials.

From the very great interest this correspondence excited during its publication in the *Times*, and from the opinion expressed by many that if it were completed and given in pamphlet form, it would command a very wide circulation and be the means of doing much good, Mr. Stephens resolved to try the experiment of publishing in this form; and trusts, with the blessing of God, that it may aid some at least, of the lovers of truth, to understand it better, and furnish them with arguments to defend it.

OWEN SOUND, 1st July, 1871.

INFALLIBILITY.

LECTURE BY THE REV. MR. FERGUSON,
AS REPORTED IN "THE OWEN SOUND TIMES" OF FEBRUARY 10, 1871.

IN accordance with announcement, Rev. M. J. Ferguson, Professor in St. Michael's College, Toronto, lectured in the Town Hall on Monday evening last, on the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. The audience numbered about five hundred; and the Lecturer (who is a fluent and eloquent speaker,) was listened to with great attention throughout. We give a short sketch of the main points touched upon.

The Lecturer commenced by stating that he did not intend to treat the subject from a controversial point, but simply to state the doctrine as Roman Catholics hold it, and give the reasons why they did so. A great deal of superficial theology is talked in these days by people who know very little about the subjects they are discussing, and especially had this been the case with the dogma of Infallibility. A great many of the newspapers had taken it up and condemned it. It was nothing to them that eight or nine hundred men, most of them of mature years, and able theologians, had, after deliberation, given their assent to it—they unhesitatingly pronounced it ridiculous; the Pope was a poor old man, a good old man, but this was making a God of him. This doctrine is believed in by two or three hundred millions of Catholics. Such clear-headed and able men as Von Moltke and Lord Napier are firm believers in it. Of course this is no proof that the dogma is true, but it is a reason why a modest man should treat the subject with respect when it comes before him in controversy, and admit that it may possibly be true.

The doctrine as held by Roman Catholics is simply this: That the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, and through that, Primate of the Church, is preserved in his official capacity from error, so long, and only so long, as he is propounding a doctrine to the whole Christian world. It simply means that God has granted that one man is preserved from error in his doctrinal capacity. And why may not that be true? We know that God works by means which we would consider insignificant. When the blind man came to our Saviour, He made use of such an humble instrument as clay to restore his sight. So in baptismal regeneration; we know that the water does not touch the soul, yet God makes use of it as the means by which regeneration is communicated. There is nothing therefore strange in supposing that He might make one man head of the Church, and in order that he may be fitted for the position, give him the gift of infallibility. The probability of this becomes stronger when we know that the chief pontiff of the Jewish Church was preserved from doctrinal error, and that under circumstances which showed that his personal character had nothing to do with it. When our Saviour was brought into his presence to have sentence pronounced against Him, then, if ever,

might the gift have been withdrawn; but even when contemplating such a crime he was saved from doctrinal error, and uttered a prophecy which was true—that it was expedient that one man should die for the people. And we are expressly told that, this he said, not of himself, but because he was High Priest that year, and did prophesy. In stating these things we are merely setting forth our view, and leaving the controversial proofs to those who desire to go into such things. We claim that the Pontiffs of the Jewish Church were endowed with freedom from doctrinal error; and there is nothing strange in believing that to that purer Church which our Saviour instituted, a like power should be given. We know that Christ instituted a Church, and that it cannot go wrong; for He said that on this Rock He would build His Church, and the gates of hell should not prevail against it. To those whom He constituted the heads of that Church, He granted the power—neither more nor less than what He brought Himself—“As my Father sent me, so send I you.” This is a tremendous thought, that to weak, sinful man such power should be communicated; but it is not for us to dispute what Christ says. We hold that to the Church was delegated that very omnipotence which Christ brought to earth—that in fact it is the continuance of His presence amongst us. Because we know that no man is capable of himself of understanding spiritual things, we look that Christ should be with and guide those to whom He has given the commission to teach. At the creation, when man was formed, the body was first made, but it was not fitted for the work for which it was destined till God breathed into its nostrils the breath of life—so when Christ had taken sinners and built them into His body, the Church, they were not capable of performing the work assigned them until He had breathed upon them a higher spirit. Until that had taken place, they were as incapable as any other twelve men; but as soon as that took place they became as it were of a higher nature, and taught not of themselves, but by the Holy Ghost which was in them; and the promise was that He would be with them always, even unto the end of the world. We hold that the Spirit descended on the day of Pentecost, not merely for the personal sanctification of the apostles, but to fit them for their work; and that that sustainment is as operative now as it was then, because it was promised unto the end of the world. We hold (because we know they appointed them,) that that Spirit is still with their successors, and will be while there is a creature upon the earth to whom the gospel has to be preached. Our body changes so that every seven years it is completely renewed, but we are still the same men. The Apostles are dead, Popes die, and Bishops die; but their deaths no more change the nature of that Church which Christ instituted than does the change of the body change the man—that is the doctrine of Infallibility. The hand by writing can communicate impressions in a certain sense spiritual on those around, yet we know that not in the fingers lies this power, but in the spirit which controls; so infallibility is not in the person, but in the spirit which dwells in him. The doctrine of Infallibility is that when it acts in its corporate capacity—the Church becomes, not so many mere men, but the Holy Spirit speaking to men, and therefore infallible; because we do not wish to be guilty of the blasphemy of thinking the Spirit could speak that which is not true.

When Christ, having become incarnate, found the time approaching

when He was summoned back, He said, I will make a Church, build it on a Rock, and give it power, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Christ said it, and we believe it, and that it continues; and will any one call us names and charge us with elevating the creature above the position he should occupy, because we do so? We believe the Holy Ghost resides in the Church—that is the infallibility of the Church; and having said that, we have the infallibility of the Pope; for they are one and the same thing. We cannot conceive of a body without a head. The Church is the body of Christ. It may be said He is the head; but He is the spiritual, not the visible head, and as the body is visible, it must have a visible head. We hold that St. Peter was appointed as that head, for Christ said to him, "On this rock will I build my Church," and "I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom." Putting away the reference to the rock, about which there is controversy, the promise to give to him the Keys of the Kingdom was made in the singular number, and could refer to none other but Peter. The keys we all know to be the symbol of authority, and in olden times when a city was conquered it was customary for the chief magistrate to march out and give up the keys, symbolical of his authority to the conqueror. Peter may not have been any more distinguished or better than the other apostles, but it was necessary that authority should be given to some one, and to him it was given. To him Christ also said, "Feed my lambs," and "Feed my sheep;" and the only explanation which can be given of this, is that it refers to the whole people of God. To other apostles was given the power to hear confessions—"Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained"—but to Peter alone was given the commandment to feed His sheep. And if Christ gave him a commandment to feed His sheep, He must have given him power to discriminate between truth and error, so that he might be able to feed them with the truth—in fact, given to him the power of infallibility. Suppose a father should go away from home, leaving his children in the care of a servant, giving him command to feed them, at the same time leaving poisonous with the good bread, and not telling the servant how to discriminate between them, what would be thought of him? And would we not be accusing Christ of the like if we believed that He gave Peter command to feed, without giving him power to discriminate between truth and error?

In the present lecture, it was not the intention to deal with controversy; but it was necessary to meet *one or two objections*. A great many people thought the dogma of Infallibility held that the Pope could not sin; but there could not be a greater mistake than to confound impeccability with Infallibility—one is a matter of the will, the other of the intellect; and we know from actual experience that the will can go wrong when the judgment is right. The Lecturer knew an instance of a physician whose friends had to shut him up for several days when they wanted his advice; but his intellect was strong and clear, and his judgment on medical matters well nigh infallible. It is a common thing to find men intellectually clever who are morally bad; and while we contend that *the Pope is doctrinally infallible*, we do not claim that he has immunity from sin—in fact, we know that he goes to confession as regularly as the *humblest priest*.

It is made an *argument* against infallibility that Peter denied his Master; but then it must be remembered that the Holy Spirit was

not given until the day of Pentecost, and consequently the apostles were not inspired till that time. Then we are told of the great schism in the middle ages, when there were three claimants to the pontifical chair, who excommunicated each other, and we are asked, Where was Infallibility then. If two different Councils should happen to be elected for a town, and sit in adjoining rooms annulling what each other did, would all municipal power necessarily lapse? We know that power to execute the laws must still remain somewhere, and that one of them must have been the proper Council, though we could not distinguish which. So when these men contended against each other, one must still have been the rightful Pope. Their course was a grave scandal to the Church, and deeply to be deplored; but even then they did not contradict each other in doctrinal matters.

Then we are told that the Pope condemned Galileo, which was not the case, for it was only a council of the Church which did so; and even if he had, it would be no proof against Infallibility, for he is not necessarily an astronomer, and it is only when enunciating religious doctrine, that he is preserved from error.

Is the doctrine not consistent? If God did appoint one man to be the head of the church, and to feed it with doctrinal truth, would you say He had not the right or the power? And He instituted the means by which this was to be done—the Spirit of Truth. So Pio Nono, as the successor of St. Peter, although a poor feeble old man, yet through that Spirit is preserved from doctrinal error. The decision of the Council did not make the dogma; but the dogma made the decision, which was simply to embody it in so many words to be more convenient.

We are told that Infallibility has not preserved the Pope from reverses, but that is simply in accordance with the whole course of history. For the first three hundred years, to become Bishop of Rome was to become a martyr; and of the two hundred and sixty-two Popes who have reigned, nearly all have lived lives subject to persecution. Though it grieves us to see the kind, genial old man deprived in his old age of the comforts to which he is entitled, yet even if he was put to death, it would not alter the fact of his infallibility. History tells us how Napoleon the Great treated the Pope, but chastisement came upon him, and his power was broken in the Russian campaign. His nephew withdrew his troops from Rome, saying that was his answer to Infallibility; and in three weeks after his empire was broken, and he had not a soldier that he could withdraw from anywhere. The Papacy has stood the test of over a thousand years, and has an element of strength in it which will cause it to survive all the storms which burst upon it.

The Lecturer had been careful to avoid controversy, and hoped he had got through without saying a word which could offend any one. He concluded by a tribute to Canada, his native country, and hoped that we should be able in this country to throw aside animosities, and live in harmony and good will with each other.

MR. STEPHENS' STRICTURES UPON THE FOREGOING LECTURE, IN "OWEN SOUND TIMES" OF FEBRUARY 17TH.

To the Editor of the Times:

SIR,—I attended the Lecture of Rev. Mr. Ferguson, and read your

very fair and correct report of the same in the last issue of the *Times*. The Lecturer was both pleasant and plausible; but to any one who looks below the surface of his sophistry, it is plain that he wishes his audience to take for granted the very point in dispute, that the Pope is the successor of Peter. He quotes from Matthew xvi.: "I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." This, and all else that Christ has said, and everything else that is written of Him, and of or by the Apostles in the Scriptures, we, without hesitation, believe and accept. But he asks us to take it for granted that Christ in effect also said to Peter, "You must leave the Keys of the Kingdom behind you when you die; but not to any of your fellow apostles who may survive you, but to the Bishop of the Church which is to be formed at Rome; and when he dies, the keys are to be given to the Bishop who succeeds him, and so on in succession until the end of the world; and these Bishops shall be called by the name and title of His Holiness! the Roman Pontiff! the Vicar of Christ! the Universal Bishop! and they shall have dominion over all other Churches throughout the world; and in the fulness of time he shall take unto himself (or it shall be given him) the title and power of a King; and he shall live in royal state, and he shall appoint Cardinals or Princes of the Church; and he shall claim and exercise authority, not only over all Christian congregations and communities, but over kings and nations; and shall have the right to curse, excommunicate and cast out of the Church, and condemn, not only in your name, Simon, but in my name, and in that of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, all who question his authority, which he derives from you, and to condemn them to everlasting torments: and to curse them in their bodies and their souls, in their head and their feet, and in every part and portion of their being; and in order to enforce his authority he shall enlist armies, and although I say *now* that my Kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight—your successor shall have power to say, 'My servants shall take the sword, and fight in defence of my Kingdom;' and although I say unto you, 'Be not ye called Lord,' *He* shall have the power to say to his Bishops, 'Ye *may* be called Lord;' and although I shall say, through the Holy Spirit in one of my apostles, that a Bishop shall be the husband of one wife, *he* shall have the right and the power to say that *no* Bishop shall have a wife; and although I shall appoint bread and wine to be eaten and drunk by all my disciples in remembrance of Me, *he* shall have the power and the right to ordain that the elders and deacons only, whom he shall call priests, shall drink of the wine in remembrance of Me—and the flock shall eat, not of a loaf that can be broken, but a small wafer, and this, he shall say, is the Lord's Supper.

"And he shall establish a Council, which he will call the Holy Inquisition, and he shall cause prisons and dungeons and instruments of torture to be made, and by these means he shall be able to purify the Church, by punishing those who will not have him to reign over them.

"And he shall command the faithful everywhere, to pray to thee and to my other apostles, and especially to my mother—although, to one who cried out to me, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou hast sucked,' I answered, 'Yea, rather blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it'—and shall crown her Queen of Heaven, and shall command all the people to pray to her, telling them that she can hear them from all places of

the world at the same time, although she *lost* me, her son, once in Jerusalem, and knew not where I was for three days; and he shall tell my sheep that she has more tender compassion for them than I have, although I lay down my life for their sakes; and although, in accordance with my injunction, you shall say to my disciples to 'Feed my sheep,' 'Fear God, and honour the king,' he shall have the power to *curse* the king; and although I shall say in my great commission, that I shall give to all you, my apostles: 'Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;' he shall say, unless they believe also in *his infallibility*, they shall be damned."

According to Mr. Ferguson, there are two hundred and fifty millions of Catholics who believe that the words spoken to Peter, "I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and what thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven," conferred on the Pope of Rome the right and the power to do all this.

Now, in the name of all who reverence the Word of God, I can't believe it, although this avowal bring me under the anathema of the Pope. I cannot believe it; but I believe with all intelligent Protestants, that it represents what John saw in the camera of Inspiration in the Isle of Patmos, "The woman, which is that great city, which reigns over the kings of the earth."

Mr. Ferguson said, in his lecture, that the "Jewish Pontiffs," (meaning, of course, the High Priests,) were preserved from *Doctrinal Error*, and therefore he argues that the Roman Pontiffs are so.

Does Mr. Ferguson forget, that the first High Priest said, after he had made the Golden Calf, "These are thy Gods, O Israel?" Was there no doctrinal error here? And he also forgets that when Jesus said (Mark xiv. 62,) in answer to the High Priest, that He was the Christ, the Son of the Blessed, that the High Priest pronounced it Blasphemy, and he and all his Council condemned Him to be guilty of death! Was there *no doctrinal error* here!! Was it not for this very confession, made by Peter, that the Saviour uttered those memorable words, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father who is in Heaven!" Mr. Ferguson shows plainly by this, that although he may be very well versed in the doctrines of the Papal Church, he is not so well versed in the Scriptures, and what he states on which to base what he seems to think one of his strongest arguments, I have shown from the Scriptures to be untrue.

One of the sections of the Infallible dogma, as published by the *Catholic World* for September, ends with these words, "If, therefore, any one shall say that it is not by the institution of Christ our Lord himself, or by divine right, that blessed Peter has not perpetuated successors in the primacy over the whole Church; or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter, let him be anathema." And the dogma itself ends thus: "And if any one shall presume, which God forbid, to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema." That is, in plain English, "Let him be damned, and he *is* damned"—professing to speak with the same authority as the Lord God, who said, "Let there be light, and there was light."

Now, it just comes to this, if the Pope is infallible, all Protestants and Christians who dispute the dogma, are in a state of damnation. And if he *is not* infallible, the Pope himself must be in a state of

damnation, as he lies in the name of the Holy Ghost. There is no possible escape from this. Either the Protestants or the Pope must be transfixed by one of the horns of this dilemma.

I may here observe, that the Papal is the only ecclesiastical organization, so far as I know, that publicly and solemnly, in the name of God, curses those who dispute its authority.

Now, in taking the gloss off from Mr. Ferguson's shoddy, I am not influenced by any ill feeling towards the Catholics, for ever since the time of the great O'Connell's struggle for Catholic emancipation, I have been, as was my father before me, opposed to any civil or political disqualification on account of any religious faith; and I am not now their enemy because I tell them what I believe to be the truth.

W. A. STEPHENS.

Owen Sound, February 14, 1871.

P.S.—In order to show the character of Pope Pius, whom Mr. Ferguson called "that kind and genial old man, whom everybody loved," I shall ask you, Mr. Editor, to copy the following *paternal* address to Victor Emmanuel. And with your permission, I shall give the readers of the *Times*, next week, a poem entitled "How Peter used the Keys of the Kingdom," which is now being published in my forthcoming book.

The Anathema Maranatha, or Everlasting Curse of the Roman Catholic Church, promulgated against Victor Emmanuel.

"By the authority of the Almighty God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; and of the holy canons; and of the undefiled Virgin Mary, mother and nurse of our Saviour; and of the celestial virtues, angels, arch-angels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubims and seraphims; and of all the holy patriarchs and prophets; and of all the apostles and evangelists; and of the holy innocents (who in the sight of the Holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song); and of the holy martyrs and holy confessors; and of the holy virgins; and of all the saints, together with all the holy and elect of God—we excommunicate and anathematize him, and from the threshold of the Holy Church of God Almighty we sequester him, that he may be tormented in eternal excruciating sufferings, together with Dathan and Abiram, and those who say to the Lord God, 'Depart from us; we desire none of Thy ways.' And as fire is quenched with water, so shall the light of him be put out forevermore.

"May the Father, who created man, curse him. May the Son, who suffered for us, curse him. May the Holy Ghost, which was given to us in our baptism, curse him. May the Holy Cross, which Christ (for our salvation, triumphing over his enemies) ascended, curse him. May the Holy and Eternal Virgin Mary, Mother of God, curse him. May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May all the angels and archangels, principalities and powers, and all the heavenly armies curse him. May St. John, the precursor, and St. John the Baptist, and St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and all other Christ's apostles, curse him. And may the rest of His disciples, and the four Evangelists (who by their preaching converted the universal world), and may the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors (who by their holy works are found pleading to God Almighty) curse him.

"May the choir of the Holy Virgins (who for the honour of Christ have despised the things of the world) damn him; may all the saints (who from the beginning of the world and everlasting ages are found to be beloved of God) damn him; may the heavens and the earth, and all the holy things remaining therein, damn him.

"May he be damned wherever he be, whether in the house or in the field, whether in the highway or the byway, whether in the wood or the water, or whether in the Church. May he be cursed in living, and in dying, in eating and drinking, in fasting and thirsting, in slumbering and sleeping, in watching or walking, in standing or sitting, in lying down or working, *mingendo, cacendo*, and in blood-letting.

"May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body. May he be cursed inwardly and outwardly. May he be cursed in his hair. May he be cursed in his brains. May he be cursed in the crown of his head and in his temples. In his forehead and in his ears. In his eyebrows and in his cheeks. In his jawbones and in his nostrils. In his foreteeth and in his grinders. In his lips and in his throat. In his shoulders and in his wrists. In his arms, his hands, and in his fingers.

"May he be damned in his mouth, in his breast, in his heart, and in all the viscera of his body; may he be damned in his veins and in his groin, in his thighs and in his genital organs, in his hips and in his knees, in his legs, feet, and toe-nails.

"May he be cursed in all the joints and articulations of his members. From the top of his head to the sole of his foot may there be no soundness in him.

"May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of His majesty, curse him; and may Heaven, with all the powers that move therein, rise up against him, curse and damn him! Amen. So be it. Amen"

LETTER No. 2 OF MR. STEPHENS.

(From "*Owen Sound Times*" of February 23rd, 1871.)

To the Editor of the Times:

At the close of my remarks in your last issue, on the Infallibility Dogma, I stated my intention of giving your readers a poem from my book now in course of publication, with the title, "How Peter used the Keys of the Kingdom." In treating this subject, I have aimed to do so as seen from a New Testament standpoint, which is the only true authority in this matter. It may be thought by some that this is not a poetical subject. My own opinion is that almost any subject may be fit for poetry to one who is able to treat it fittingly. Whether or not I have succeeded in this instance, others must judge; but I am satisfied that I have given truth supported by sound argument and legitimate illustration.

Yours truly,

W. A. STEPHENS.

HOW PETER USED THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM.

"The Keys of my Kingdom I give unto thee—
What you bind upon earth, so in Heav'n shall be;

What you loose upon earth, shall in Heav'n be free."

Those wonderful words, unto Peter, He spoke,
Who holds the whole universe under His yoke;
For Peter was first to confess, what all now
As the chief corner-stone of salvation avow—
That Jesus is Christ, and the Son of that God,
Whose feet on the bounds of the boundless have trod;
Whose life is Eternity, and at a glance,
Takes in all eternity and all expanse.

"I will give thee the keys." And when were they given?

And when did they open the kingdom of Heaven?

Peter first used the keys on the Great Pentecost,*

When he opened the door to the first redeemed host;

And he left the door open that Jews of all times,

Who believe in the Lord and repent of their crimes,

And in Christ are "baptised for remission of sin"†

The kingdom of Heav'n may all enter in.

But the *Gentiles* as yet, have no part in the grace—

It only is opened to *Israel's* race.

But a light to the *Gentiles*, Christ must be, as well

As the glory and saviour of old *Israel*.

So Peter while fasting, falls into a trance,‡

And sees altogether at one loathsome glance,

All reptiles and beasts and all foul creeping things,

And birds with carnivorous talons and wings.

"Peter slay them and eat, and thine hunger allay."

"Not so for in this I'd the Law disobey;

For all I see there, Moses says are unclean,

And such in my mouth, Lord, there never has been."

"What God has made clean, do thou not common call;"

And straight back to heaven the Lord took them all—

Cornelius has prayed, and his alms have been given;

An angel has come with a message from Heaven,

"Thy prayers and thine alms are recorded for thee;

Now send men to Joppa, and there by the sea

You'll find Simon Peter, He'll come unto you,

And then he will tell what thou oughtest to do."

Simon Peter has come, and perceives with surprise

That men of all nations to life may arise;

Who fear the true God and righteousness do;

And he speaks now to *Gentile* as first to the *Jew*.

He tells them of Christ and remission of sins;

As he preaches the *Gentiles'* salvation begins.

The Spirit comes down, as they hear of Christ's blood,

And they speak with new tongues and magnify God.

And Peter then saw he must open the door,

To those, as he did to the *Jews* once before.

He again used the keys, and the gate open flew—

It is ever since open to *Gentile* and *Jew*.

And at once, in accordance with Christ's sacred word,

He said be "baptised in the name of the Lord."

Thus Peter alone had the right to each race

To open the door of the kingdom of grace.

*Acts ii. †Acts ii. 38. ‡Acts x.

When this had been done, the apostles were all
 On a level and equal from Peter to Paul.
 "Christ is your master and all ye are brothers;*"

Let none of you then lord it over the others."
 They sit on twelve thrones, no pre-eminence given
 To one more than any they're equal in Heaven.
 The Pope says that Peter was prince over all,
 And he, the successor of Peter men call
 The vicar of Christ and the head of the Church;
 He wields both the spiritual sceptre and birch,
 And he tells us that he is infallibly strong.
 To fix for all nations the right and the wrong.
 I'll mention some reasons why this cannot be,
 And ask him some questions, if not thought too free;
 And if with these reasons he fairly can cope,
 I'll admit him to be a most clever old Pope.
 History tells us that Peter was slain, crucified;
 Of the *twelve* that he was not the last one who died;
 And all will admit that at least there was one
 Who long survived Peter—the loved loving John.
 If the Pontiff's pretensions don't fade in the light,
 He was prince over John and ruled him of right!
 And is it not strange that the Lord should ignore
 The Pope His own Vicar who must have felt sore,
 To be so much slighted, for Christ came alone
 To see and commune with his old beloved John.
 If Peter were prince, and John his successor,
 The Pope must be greater and John must be lesser.
 Then why should John only receive revelations
 That look through all time and the future of nations?
 And Christ's mighty Vicar then reigning at Rome,
 Never noticed at all, *unless as to come*!!
 And again, I would ask, if St. Peter were Prince,
 A question to make the Pope's votaries wince:
 When the twelve had a strife, who should greatest be made,†
 And this on the night when their Lord was betrayed,
 Why did not Christ tell them, to quiet the strife
 "I've made Peter Prince, I have crowned him for life;
 And when I depart, he my vicar shall be,
 And you all must submit unto him as to me."
 And at the great Council, the first and the last‡
 Ever held, till the age of Apostles was pass'd,
 Why did not St. Peter, instead of St. James,
 Deliver the sentence, deciding the claims
 Of those who insisted, "They must be enslaved
 To the law, or the Gentiles can never be saved."
 The Council accepted the sentence so fair
 From James who *presided*, tho' Peter was there!
 And if Peter were chief, what assumption in Paul §
 To censure Christ's vicar, in presence of all;
 And not only so, but besides to record
 His censure and zeal in the work of the Lord,

*Matt. xxiii. 8. †Luke xxii. 24. ‡Acts xv. §Gal. ii. 11, 14.

And pronounce without favor his stern condemnation,
 Of unstable Peter's weak dissimulation."
 If Peter's the Rock, as per Rome's explanation,
 Sure Paul did not build upon such a foundation.
 And what if some Cardinal now should but dare
 To censure *his master* with such a bold air?
 Assumption like this would at once be put down,
 And the rebel would meet the whole Catholic frown,
 As condensed in the look of surprise and disdain
 From him who now o'er the great city doth reign!*

Not so with good Peter, how meekly he took
 The stern, but much needed, and faithful rebuke;
 And years after this, in his letter to all
 The brethren, he speaks of "belov'd brother Paul."
 'Tis clear 'twas not known, or by Peter or people,
 That he had been made both foundation and steeple;
 For had he but known his position and pow'r,
 He soon would have made the bold Tarsian cow'r;
 For all who have pow'r always know and assert it—
 This truth is so plain that you can't controvert it;
 It has ever been so, in the Church and the State,
 And Army and Navy, since earliest date.
 King, Captain and Priest, Premier, Bishop and Czar,
 If you question their rank they are ready for war;
 And at once you will notice their countenance low'r,
 If you dare to resist their legitimate pow'r.
 And so it is plain neither Peter nor Paul
 Ever knew that the Lord had set *one* over *all*?

LETTER FROM MR. GEORGE SPENCER.

(From "*Owen Sound Times*" of February 23rd, 1871.)

To the Editor of the Times:

SIR,—I was surprised to see in your last issue, a letter from Mr. W.A. Stephens about the lecture on "Infallibility," lately delivered in this town, by the Rev. Mr. Ferguson.

When the Rev. lecturer commenced, he told his audience that his purpose was not to create a controversy, but merely to explain the grounds on which the Catholic Church believed the dogma. He repeated this more than once during his lecture, and it was not hard to see that he did not wish to hurt anybody's feelings, neither did he say anything calculated to do so.

Well then I ask, what crime has been committed by Mr. Ferguson against our common christianity, or even against the laws of politeness or good breeding, that he, a gentleman, a christian, and a clergyman, should receive such gratuitous insults at the hands of a man who also calls himself a christian, and who, if he believes in Christianity at all, must believe in the doctrine preached by St. Paul in the thirteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians? I will

*Just after I had written this, I observed an account of the Pope summoning a Cardinal to his presence for daring to dispute the dogma of Infallibility, and treating him as I here state he would do.

not quote from the Holy Apostle; anybody who reads this bit of a letter of mine can examine this chapter for himself.

But Mr. Editor, I think I hear some one or other of my Protestant friends saying, "I don't see any harm in Mr. Stephens' letter; he has merely given his opinion, criticised the lecture a little, and exposed some of the errors of Romanism."

Is that all he has done? Let us see. He calls the Lecturer "pleasant and plausible." *Plausible* is a word always taken in a bad sense, and *pleasant* being coupled with it, must be taken in a bad sense also; this is the positive degree, or stage No. 1, of insinuating that the Reverend gentleman is a hypocrite and a humbug! Then he talks about "looking below the surface of his sophistry." Sophistry also is a word taken in a bad sense, and is a little worse than plausibility. This is the comparative degree, or stage No. 2 of insinuating that the Reverend gentleman is a hypocrite and a humbug. The last paragraph of his Letter refers to the Lecturer's "SHODDY, *off from which Mr. Stephens has taken the gloss.*" We all know the meaning of the word "shoddy," and it must be taken in a worse sense than either plausibility or sophistry. Here we have the superlative degree, or stage No. 3 of the insinuation! So that the Rev. Mr. Ferguson, one of the Professors of St. Michael's College, of Toronto, who is, as I said before, a gentleman, a christian, and a clergyman; who is loved and revered by all who know him, as being one of the most straightforward and sincere of men, is stated by Mr. W. A. Stephens of the town of Owen Sound, who is a lay member of a small sect of Christians called Campbellites or Disciples, to be a pleasant, plausible, sophistical shoddyist.

Not content with thus villifying Mr. Ferguson, he creates an opportunity of having a nice sly stab at Catholics in general when he says: "According to Mr. Ferguson, there are two hundred and fifty millions of Catholics who believe that the words spoken to Peter, 'I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and what thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven,' conferred on the Pope of Rome the right and the power to do all this. Now, in the name of all who reverence the Word of God, I can't believe it, although this avowal bring me under the anathema of the Pope, &c."

He here says, "In the name of all who reverence the Word of God, I can't believe it." Pretty hard to tell what "it" means, according to the construction—might mean Father Ferguson's statement about the hundred and fifty millions of Catholics; if so, then there is an insinuation that Father Ferguson is a liar—might mean that long list of nonsense which he wishes to shew "according to Mr. Ferguson" that Catholics believe, although according to Mr. Ferguson *nothing of the sort was stated*, Mr. Stephens having merely drawn on his imagination for all that. If the latter then there is an insinuation that Catholics do not reverence the Word of God (meaning the written Word of God I presume.) This would be a gross slander not worth trying to refute.

I am endeavoring to keep entirely clear of Theology, whether I can continue to the end to do so I cannot say; but I do not like polemical discussions—scarcely ever do they either change or modify the religious opinions of any one. If needs be, I can give a good account of my faith; but such is not my object. I wish to reprove, as far as one humble individual can, the bad taste, the spite, the malice,

against the Reverend Lecturer and against Catholics in general, which crops up throughout Mr. Stephens' Letter.

In his last paragraph, just before that precious postscript of his; having scratched, written, and clawed to his heart's content, he apes the Good Samaritan, and tries to pour in a very little oil and wine, by saying that he is not influenced by any ill-will towards the Catholics. I suppose that after what he had written, he thought some such phantom of an apology was necessary. Why should he have any ill-will towards us? Are we not as good Christians as others? Are we not as good citizens as others? Are we not as inoffensive as others? Don't we mind our own business as much as others? Don't we abstain from meddling with other people's opinions as much as others—especially Mr. Stephens? If Mr. Stephens is not actuated by ill-will towards us, he has a curious way of shewing it. Does he think that any Catholic Christian who reads his Letter will think he is not so actuated? No, sir: bitter hatred is too strongly manifested throughout his production to allow any such to suppose so; and whether the feeling exhibited is directed against us as individuals, or collectively, as members of the Catholic Church, it is equally uncharitable. But sir, we can stand it, and the Church can stand it. That Church which has stood the assaults of the Sectarians for one thousand eight hundred and odd years, is not going to be demolished just yet; in fact not till the consummation of all things, and then not demolished but only changed from the Catholic Church militant to the Catholic Church triumphant. Her mission always has been, is, and always will be, during time, to lift up her voice against the errors of the centuries. What she was in the first century, she was also in the second! What she was in the second, she has been ever since, and is now in the nineteenth: and such she will continue to be until the end of time; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her!

I am, Mr. Editor, Yours truly,

GEORGE SPENCER.

LETTER No. 1 OF MR. FERGUSON.

(From "*Owen Sound Times*" of March 3rd, 1871.)

To the Editor of the Times:

DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly allow me a small space in your columns, that I may correct a very ridiculous blunder your last week's correspondent about Infallibility fell into. In his Letter published in your paper, he gives under the name of a *paternal address* from Pius the Ninth to the King of Italy, a tirade of mingled obscenity and blasphemous of the most shocking and disgusting nature.

We are forced, out of a desire we have to entertain a good opinion of your correspondent, to consider that he thought this horrible stuff was a papal document. Of course he was bound in common honesty, and out of consideration for his Catholic neighbors, to make serious efforts to discover the truth. We hope he did, and that the great crime he has committed in ascribing this monstrous production to the Head of the Catholic Church, is due, not to unfairness, but to a lack of scholarship. I am quite convinced, Mr. Editor, I need not tell you (who doubtless enjoyed a hearty laugh at the silly mistake) the history of this *paternal address*.

Every reader is acquainted with the name of the Rev. Laurence Sterne, a witty clever Irishman. He was born at Clonmel, in Tipperary, in the year 1718. He spent his life in an atmosphere of mischievous merriment, poking fun at everybody and everything that furnished an opportunity for making a laugh. Not even the sacred character of a clergyman—he took vows in the English Church—could repress this natural levity, and he tells us in his autobiography “books, painting, *fiddling* and shooting were my amusements,” in his parish of Stillington in Yorkshire.

Such an unclerical mode of passing his time was, we suppose, the reason why he was often ill prepared to preach to his flock on Sunday. But whoever heard of a Tipperary man without his resources? “When he had little to say or little to give his people, he had recourse to the abuse of Popery. Hence he called it his ‘Cheshire Cheese.’ It had a two-fold advantage—it cost him very little, and he found by experience that nothing satisfied so well the hungry appetite of his congregation. They always devoured it greedily.”

The man who wrote this, wrote also a book called “*Tristram Shandy*,” and in obedience to the admirable principle enunciated by him above, he took to the abuse of Popery, in the form of a sentence of excommunication, supposed to have been passed, not by a Pope, but by a certain Ernulphus, Bishop of Rochester. The whole history of the thing, may be found in “*Tristram Shandy*”, pp. 78 et seq. in the edition of that work published by George Routledge & Sons, London.

Now, will anybody believe that this piece of wicked, blasphemous mockery, which has just enough of Catholic phraseology in it to deceive the very unwary, could have been published by a gentleman pretending to be a theologian, and ascribed to a reigning Pontiff. It is humiliating in the last degree to think that any one could have made such a stupid mistake; and if it is not a mistake—if the writer knew what it was when he had it published, we know of no words strong enough to condemn such foul dealing. We are inclined to think, however, that it was your correspondent's learning, not his honesty, that was at fault, and so dismiss the painful thing from our mind with just one observation, that however the Lecturer may have succeeded in proving Papal Infallibility, the correspondent has been most triumphantly successful in showing himself fallible, very *fallible* indeed! And if his theological knowledge is at all equal to his critical scholarship, that promised book of his will be a gem in its way.

Of course, for reasons that this Letter will make obvious to every one, I take no notice at all of the first half of his Letter. Indeed, there is not a word in it that does not go rather to prove than to disprove our claim, provided of course, it be admitted that God, and not man, made the church.

Your obedient servant,

M. J. FERGUSON

LETTER No. 2 OF MR. FERGUSON.

(From “*Owen Sound Times*” of March 10th, 1871.)

To the Editor of the Times:

DEAR SIR,—We suppose we must answer the *theology* of Mr. Stephen's letter, not because it contains a single sentiment of any weight

against our views, but because if we do not notice it he might think it was a difficulty for us.

The letter itself while it does not prove that its writer may not be an honest man, certainly does little to establish for him a reputation for ability of any kind, and is as slovenly and lumbering a production as anything we have had the misfortune to meet with for some time. It sets out with a kind of compliment to me, which from such a source, I hope I know how to estimate; and then goes on to charge me with having asked the audience to assume—what Mr. Stephens considers the very point in dispute. Now the gentleman was present at the Lecture, and therefore knows that I neither assumed anything myself nor asked any one else to assume anything of any kind or sort. I was not in controversy at all, but simply stating the theory of the Catholic Church on the question of Infallibility. Argument of whatever kind was neither attempted nor thought of, and as assumption belongs, not to statement, in which I was engaged, but to argument, in which I was not engaged, I, of course, could not be guilty of any kind of assumption. This is Mr. Stephens' first mistake. His second is more serious, for it consists in doing the very thing which he is so wrathful for thinking (wrongly) I did.

If the interminable sentence, "the vast extent of flimsy lines" beginning with "But he asks," and ending about half a column from these words, means anything at all, it means that in his estimation the simple fact that we Catholics, numerous though we certainly are, make any claim, or put forth any pretensions, is disproof, more than sufficient, of both the claim and the pretension. His reasoning, when put into shape (and it sorely needs methodising) is this: If Protestantism be the truth, Catholicity and Catholics are a great humbug; but Protestantism is the truth, therefore, &c., &c. That this is not a mistaken notion of mine, is fully evinced by the writer's express declaration, further on, to the effect that if the Pope is infallible, all Protestants are wrong. There is not a doubt about this. No man, outside of a lunatic asylum, can pretend that of two contradictions, more than one can be true. The great point in discussion between us is, not at all whether the one or the other is false, but which of the two is true, and which is false. Poor Mr. Stephens, misled by his vanity, or let us hope by his honest but uninstructed zeal, and happily oblivious of the ponderous volumes that have left the momentous question still unsettled, in the most innocent manner imaginable, quietly assumes the truth of his own views, and then goes on to conclude that I was a very foolish fellow indeed for daring to question them.

His logic reminds me of nothing in the world so forcibly, as of his criticism, which did not know the difference between the foul production of a profligate Protestant minister of the 18th century, and a "paternal address" of the sainted Pius the IX. In proof that we are not misrepresenting this theological luminary, it is not necessary to follow him through the wide range of topics in discussion between Catholics and Protestants, though on the assumption that everything Catholic is therefore false, he has dragged in matter enough for twenty folio volumes of controversy. Let an instance of his own choosing suffice. He admits that I was right in my commentary on the passage of Holy Scripture which speaks of the grant of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to St. Peter: "This we, without hesita-

tion, believe and accept." These are his own words. Well, then, Mr. Stephens, if Peter received from Christ the Keys of Christ's Kingdom, with power to bind and loose, and have his sentence, whether loosing or binding, ratified in heaven, what would you call his office? The word lieutenant or vicar, is the expression men use to characterize him who holds, by delegation from his sovereign, the power symbolized by the keys, i.e., jurisdiction. Now, you say that Peter did receive this power, and from Christ Himself, who alone either opens the Kingdom of Heaven, or is able to delegate this power of opening to anybody. What then would you call Peter? I suppose nothing else than the Vicar of Christ; there is no other word in the language so apt to express the relation between the two. This, then, is your own admission. Now, let us see what use you make of it: you don't say one word to show that after the death of one Vicar, whose possession of that high office you admit, there might not by some chance be another—as is exceedingly likely, since nobody pretends that the gift of the keys to Peter was for his own especial benefit, but rather for the good of the world, and the world lasted after him—not a word; but as usual, quietly (I almost wrote impudently) assume that no such office could possibly descend to anybody else, and then use the claim our theory makes, that there is still a Vicar of Christ on the earth, as an irrefragable proof that there is not. Let me once again, and for the last time, throw your clumsy argument into logical shape:

Peter, I admit, was the Vicar of Christ, or what is the same thing, received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Now, as the successor of a king is a king, so the successor of the Vicar of Christ is the Vicar of Christ. Therefore the Pope is not the successor of Peter, or he would be Vicar of Christ, and Mr. Ferguson would be right, which cannot be true. Shades of Aristotle, what logic! And this wild nonsense Mr. Stephens has the exquisite taste and decency to call "Taking the gloss off Mr. F.'s shoddy." (Query: What does this sentence mean?)

Now, my kind, frank Mr. Stephens, why should not *I* be right as well as *you*? You may be, indeed, a tremendous man, a very Goliath in Scripture and reasoning, though I am afraid a few letters like your last will injure your reputation. You may not have done yourself justice in that communication; but still, if you were twenty-five times the genius you are, or think yourself to be, I would still consider myself justified in holding my own views, not because they *are* my own, but because I find them advocated and maintained by men so much superior to both of us, that they could roll up some scores of us in the corner of their pocket handkerchief, nor know we, poor little things, were there. Surely it is wiser for me, putting aside all higher ground of belief, to follow them, and the great majority of the Christian world, than you and the baker's dozen, relatively, who think with you. I, and two hundred and fifty millions of people, think there was a transmission of the power of the Keys; the mightiest Institution in the earth, the only Church that claims and shews the notes spoken of in the Apostle's Creed, attests my views. You and a few others who cannot agree on anything else among yourselves, deny it; but your denial by no means proves itself, and you have not said a word in proof of it. Quit your noisy, insulting language then, until you have something better to give me than the mere word of yourself. Of course, as my Lecture was not concerned with proofs at all, I do not trouble myself with giving them here. On you, as the

attacking party, rests the burden of proving me wrong. For the present, I simply claim the right of possession. Passing now quickly over a deal of such stuff as I have been animadverting on, I come to a remark of yours on which I wish to dwell a moment. You think you refute the Church's claim of Infallibility by charging her with having sometimes excommunicated and anathematized certain members of her own body, who had fallen away from the sanctity required by their state, and given scandal. Now, what would you do if a cancer made its appearance on your nose? Have it cut off to save your life, or let it eat away your face? Everybody knows what you ought to do, and therefore if you are a man of sense, we know your answer. The Church, in the same way, cuts off from her communion such as are so bad as to be a source of danger to the rest of her children; and if her language is sometimes stern and awfully severe in these dreadful cases, we take it, this is no more a reason why she should be condemned, than is the fact that the surgeon in the case supposed, must cut with a knife; or that the law uses, not a velvet necktie, but a cord of hard hemp on those fearful occasions when she orders executions, is reason why we should question the surgeon's right to save life by removing a cancer, or the right of the law to save society by hanging murderers and scoundrels. I hope the gentleman sees by this time the absurdity and foolishness of his objection. His whole mistake, and we trust it was only a mistake, comes from this, that he has no experience of God's Church, and won't open his eyes and see; but with an instinct like a class of birds with an ugly name, that won't eat meat till it is reeking, he chooses to fix his attention not on the sanctity of the Body of Christ, which is His Church, but on the errors of individuals here and there within her. And again, what would you think of an urchin, that, having tortured the plastic dough the cook threw to him to keep him from disturbing her, into the remotest resemblance to the human form divine, would base his judgment of man, God's creation and child, upon his experiences of this lump of flour and water? You wouldn't give much for his conclusions. In the same way, men, not content with the Church Christ made for the sanctification of the world, have tried their hands, like *sonny* with the dough, in making a church for themselves; and just as *sonny* knows that his dough can neither speak nor act, nor feel, so they know that their poor contrivance, ye!e!pt a Church, has no attributes but such as they gave it, and can therefore neither say yes nor no; can neither condemn the sinner nor uphold the saint—is indeed, nothing in the world but a monument of their own pride and folly and presumption. But the Church that Jesus made, that He built upon a rock, against which the gates of Hell can never prevail, and which he called "My Church," *Ecclesiam Meam*;—it has wisdom, and it has power. It has Infallibility because He that is Almighty hath said "I will send you the Holy Ghost, and He will teach you all truth, and abide with you forever;" and it has power, as to bless the good, so also to curse and anathematize and drive out from it whatever is false; for again, hath not Jesus, whose word never faileth, said, (Matthew xviii. 17,) "And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican;" and St. Paul, (Titus iii. 10) "A man that is an heretic avoid." Ah! Mr. Stephens, if your miserable contrivances, which you call Churches, were not the work of your own hands, little dolls on which you lavish a

fondness that makes one knowing better, respect, while he pities you, as—to use the great Wiseman's image—we would pity a mother that rocks the cradle of her dead child; if they were not your own work, but work of God, you would not find it strange that both Infallibility and Power were claimed for them. But I must hurry to the end. I am now done with you, and intend to take no more notice of any further communication you may address to me; I am too busy, and too far away from Owen Sound, and the paper does not reach me in time. Besides, we are so used to such attacks as yours, that we don't much mind them. You may offend, you cannot hurt us. When I was in Quebec last year, visiting the great citadel, the pride and strength of our Dominion, I saw a foul animal that had been wallowing in the mire, rub his itching back against a buttress of the mighty fortification and soil it. What a pity! thought I, so filthy an animal should be able to soil even a stone of that which 10,000 gallant men might assail in vain. Much in the same way, though I don't make the application too close, as I wish to be civil, men may plunge into every quagmire of heresy, and in their laudable eagerness to shake themselves clean, may rub rudely against a buttress of the old Church, and soil its outer seeming in the eyes of ignorance equal to, or greater than its own; may for a moment, and in uninstructed minds, bring into disrepute some of the grand old dogmas that, revealed by Christ, and interpreted by Catholicity, have consoled the saints and christianized mankind. They may do this—a poor ambition—but they will never, oh, never! take a chip from the solid masonry that composes the imperishable structure of Catholic dogma. Their, little, thin, puny voices striving, to utter the miserable “No,” will be lost in the thunder with which two or three hundred millions now living, and ten thousand millions dead, who believed as we do, will reply “Yes.”

Think of this, Mr. Stephens, and it will teach you to choose game more likely to fall by the little *pop-gun, which seems to be the only weapon in your armory.

Your obedient servant,

M. J. FERGUSON.

LETTER No. 3 OF MR. STEPHENS.

(From “Owen Sound Times” of March 10th, 1871.)

To the Editor of the Times:

DEAR SIR,—Your last issue contained “a bit of a letter” (as he himself calls it) from Mr. George Spencer, in which he comes to the rescue of *Father* Ferguson, as he calls *him*, who is, he informs us twice, a gentleman, a christian, and a clergyman. I don't know of course whose *father* he is, but it does seem incongruous to hear, as is quite common, an old man of perhaps 70 or 80, address a comparative youth by the honored name of father, and especially when he is one of those who can never have any *legitimate* right to the title.

I am quite ready to admit that Mr. Ferguson is a gentleman, and a clergyman, and also a christian, according to the meaning attached to that term by Catholics, one mark of which is that he is not under the curse of the Pope for disbelieving in his infallibility; and this

*I would here remind Mr. Ferguson, that *affecting* to despise an antagonist, as past experience shows, is no proof of right, nor guarantee of victory.

curse, as I have shown in my first letter, includes all Protestants; therefore, no Protestant can be a Christian, although Mr. Spencer in his letter seems to intimate that they may be, as he speaks of "our common Christianity;" but this comes, I presume, from the natural kindness of his heart and the influence of *old associations*, for of course, he could not be guilty of the impiety of insinuating that the Infallible Vicar of Christ could ever *curse a true Christian*.

Now, although Mr. Ferguson be all that Mr. Spencer claims for him, and although I am a layman, and may be in his estimation, neither a gentleman nor a christian, how does that affect the *momentous and eternal issues between Protestants and Catholics?*

In order to reprove me for being guilty of "such gratuitous insults" as he says I was, in speaking of Mr. Ferguson's sophistry and shoddy, he refers me to the 13th of 1st Corinthians. I presume he means such passages as these: "Charity suffers long; and is kind, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil," &c. I have long had these beautiful and impressive words in my memory, and it is refreshing to hear Mr. Spencer refer me in his letter to at least one passage of the Word of God—the *written Word*, as he calls it. Is there any other than the written Word that we can or do know anything about?

I would here ask Mr. Spencer if he himself was under the influence of this charity when he charged me with being actuated by "bitter hatred, spite and malice," because I appealed to the New Testament against the teachings of Mr. Ferguson? And I would also ask, does he think that the Pope was acting under the influence of that holy principle, when he perpetrated that *double-distilled quintessence of cursing and bitterness* against Victor Emmanuel, as copied from the *Christian Review* of Cincinnati, in connection with my strictures on the Lecture?

Mr. Spencer says I took the opportunity of having a "nice, aly stab at the Catholics." Now, I think that every one but he will admit that my blows were *openly* given; and Mr. Spencer did not attempt to contradict or deny any of my facts or arguments bearing upon the points at issue. But what I showed to be the powers claimed by the Pope, under the authority of the words addressed to Peter, "I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," &c., Mr. Spencer calls "that long list of nonsense for which I had drawn upon my imagination." Is it not true, then, that the Pope claims from *this* to be Universal Bishop! to be called His Holiness! the Roman Pontiff! the Vicar of Christ! and to have dominion over all the Churches? Is it not true, then, that he claims from *this* to have the power and state of a King; to appoint Cardinals or Princes of the Church; to excommunicate, and curse all who will not submit to his authority? Is it not true that he forbids the Bishops to marry? Is it not true that he withholds the wine from the laity in the Lord's Supper? or that he has crowned Mary the Queen of Heaven, &c., &c.? Is it possible that the world has all been deluded, and that all this exists only in my imagination!!!

Since that "nonsense" was published, I have received expressions of entire approval for writing it, from all classes of Protestants, both in town and country, who say that it was just what the interests of truth in the present crisis required, and they were glad that I had come out so plainly. It is not surprising that Mr. Spencer should feel sore at the exposure, and that his zeal should outrun his discretion,

especially as he is comparatively but a new convert, and holds so important a place in the Church. For, from his social and official position, business ability, and (thanks in a great measure to his Protestant education) his general intelligence, he is of course looked up to by the laity and caressed by the Clergy, from the Bishop down, and is, I presume it will be admitted, the most influential Catholic layman in this part of the country; and he is, of course, quite conscious of this, as was plain to be seen at the Town Hall, as he stepped on the platform, attended by the priests, when he presented with such a gratified air, the Reverend Lecturer to the large and admiring audience. After such an apparent triumph, to have the *gloss* taken off from Mr. Ferguson's *infallible* exposition and defence of Infallibility, was no doubt hard to bear. For, like some others, he has not always the irascible faculties under control, and it is not surprising that they obtained the mastery in this instance.

I must here take notice of Mr. Spencer's grammatical criticism. He says his (my) speaking of Mr. Ferguson's pleasant plausibility was in the *positive* degree. His sophistry was in the *comparative* and his shoddy in the *superlative*, so that it is positive plausible, comparative sophistry; and superlative shoddy!! His grammar is about on a par with Mr. Ferguson's logic, who said: "You will admit that the Lord *could* have appointed a single individual to be the head of His Church, and therefore that he might have done so;" and from these premises he draws the conclusion that therefore he *did* do so, and therefore he appointed the Bishop of Rome to be that man's successor.

What would Mr. Spencer think if a person should be brought before him, as a Magistrate, who had in his possession a horse which was known to have been the property of a Mr. Brown, and when asked how he got the horse, he would say, "Mr. Brown gave the horse to me." Mr. S. would ask if he had any evidence to prove it. He would answer, "Yes. Your Worship will admit that Mr. Brown *could* have given the horse to me." "Yes." "Therefore you will admit that he *might* have given it to me, and therefore he *did* give it." I would ask any one of common sense, if the argument is not as good in one case as in the other.

And supposing that Mr. Spencer, who is, as is well known, a capital Conveyancer, and a good judge of title, were told by one of his friends: "I have bought a farm from Mr. B. for \$1,000, and I wish you to draw the deeds and to see that all is right." Mr. Spencer asks Mr. B. by what title he holds the land. He replies, "By deed from Mr. C., and Mr. C. holds from Mr. D.;" and shows the deeds. Mr. Spencer looks at them. "All right so far as they go; but I must search the Registry Office to find how Mr. D. holds the lot." He finds there, that the lot is still in the name of the original owner, Mr. E. Mr. Spencer tells him at once: "I cannot accept your title, for there is nothing to show that Mr. E. ever parted with the land." Mr. B. replies, "It is strange that you should dispute my title. I did not come here for any controversy, and you must admit that Mr. E. *could* have sold the lot." "Yes, I admit that he *could* have done so." "Then you must admit that he *might* have sold the lot." "Yes, Mr. B., I admit that." "Then," adds Mr. B., triumphantly, "you must admit that he *did* do so; and therefore, that he sold it to Mr. C., from whom I hold it." Those who know Mr. Spencer, can fancy how he would look in such a case.

So we Protestants take the same course. We go to the New Testament, containing the registry records of the Kingdom, and we find there a deed of gift recorded to Peter of the Keys of the Kingdom; but we cannot find any record there of their transfer to the Pope of Rome, or any one else, and therefore we can't admit his title; and in consequence of this, he tells us that he will keep the door of Heaven shut against us, and at the same time opens the door of Hell, and says we must all be pressed into it.

Mr. Spencer tells us, that what the Church of Rome was in the first century, it was in the second, and has been ever since, and will be so until the final consummation of all things. Ever since I was acquainted with Mr. Spencer, I have always accepted as true, any statement of his in any matter of fact or business with which he was personally acquainted, and would do so still; but when he makes a statement like this, I must believe that all history is a *lie* before I can accept it.

Mr. Spencer also says that the gates of Hell will never prevail against his Church—by the gates of Hell, he means, I presume, the power of Satan and his adherents in this world. Now, Mr. Spencer is well aware that the Church of Rome, as it has been for more than a thousand years, is believed by Protestants to be the great apostacy predicted by Daniel, Paul and John, and therefore they do not look upon *that church* and *those gates* as antagonistic; and therefore, that these *gates* never have and never will *try to prevail against it*.

I am, upon the whole, pleased that Mr. Spencer has by his letter given me an opportunity of further elucidating the subject; and I shall now await the onset of the renowned Father Ferguson, who has, I see by the *Times*, entered the lists, no doubt armed *cap-a-pie* for the contest. But I presume he did his best in his Lecture, and unless he can do a great deal better than that, there is not much to fear from him. He told us in that Lecture that he did not want any *controversy*. He was no doubt quite sincere in this. He was (Mr. Spencer to the contrary, notwithstanding,) pleasant and plausible, as he kept back from us those clauses of the dogma, which I showed in my letter doom all those who reject it to perdition. I have shown that he practised *sophistry* in reasoning from *false premises*, when he said the Jewish Pontiff was preserved in his official capacity from doctrinal error, and therefore the chief Pontiff of a newer faith (meaning the Pope) would be preserved in the same way. I showed these premises were false, from the example I gave when the chief priest pronounced the confession of Jesus that He was the Christ, the Son of the Blessed, to be blasphemy!

Mr. F. proposed to give us the pure *wool* of Christianity; but any one who looks at it in the light of the *written Word*, must see that it is nothing indeed but ecclesiastical *shoddy*; and because I have dared to expose it—because Mr. Ferguson, forsooth, told us he did not want anything of the kind, therefore, I have wantonly insulted him.

W. A. STEPHENS.

LETTER No. 4 OF MR. STEPHENS.

(From "*Owen Sound Times*" of March 17th, 1871.)

To the Editor of the *Times*:

DEAR SIR,—Mr. M. J. Ferguson, in your last issue, writes to

correct what he calls my "very ridiculous blunder that I fell into in publishing in the name of a paternal address of Pius the Ninth to the King of Italy, a tirade of mingled obscenity and blasphemy." And he kindly attributes my mistake to a want of *learning*, and not to want of *honesty*. But he presumes, Mr. Editor, that you *did* know that it was a mistake, for he says, "I need not tell *you* the history of this paternal address, who doubtless enjoyed a hearty laugh at the silly mistake." So, that it amounts to this, that although you were quite aware that this "tirade of mingled obscenity and blasphemy of the most shocking and disgusting nature" was false, you had not the honesty to tell me so, and refuse to publish it; but instead, "enjoyed a hearty laugh" while giving publicity to this "obscene and blasphemous" slander; so that he in effect says, that it was my want of *learning* and your want of honesty that caused the perpetration of so foul a crime.

Mr. Ferguson tells us that this paternal address was concocted by the Rev. Laurence Sterne, and published in his novel of "Tristram Shandy." Some forty years ago, I took up "Tristram Shandy," from which I had often seen extracts in other books, but to my surprise, I found it was to me rather a dull book, and I never finished it, and I do not recollect having read the Curse there. But about twenty-six years ago, I read with great interest the celebrated discussion of seven days (in 1837), between Bishop (now Archbishop) Purcell of Cincinnati, and Alexander Campbell of Bethany College, Virginia, and published, attested by the signatures of both. Mr. Campbell, in his last speech, page 330, observes: "After having read you a Bishop's Bull against the New York Catholic Society for the promotion of religious knowledge, I will, while on this subject, read you also a Bishop's Curse against a refractory priest in Philadelphia. I quote it from one of the newspapers of that day. It happened some twelve or fifteen years ago. I have several such cases in the books around me, but they are *some two or three centuries old*, and in foreign countries, and I therefore select this modern one, which is almost a copy of them." Mr. Campbell then read the Curse, and it is almost an exact copy of the Curse which Mr. Ferguson denounces so fiercely as "a tirade of blasphemy," &c.

Bishop Purcell, in his reply to Mr. Campbell, stated that "it was the *jeu d'esprit* of a Protestant minister named Laurence Sterne, and found in his book, one of the most grossly obscene in the English language. But the Bishop neglected to notice the fact stated by Mr. Campbell just before reading the Curse, that he had "several such in the books around him, but they were some two or three centuries old." After he had read it, he said, "Ridiculous as this may appear, laughable or profane—it is, nevertheless, but the echo of one of the one hundred anathemas commanded in the Council of Trent—one of the greater excommunications due to an obstinate heretic!"

Mr. Ferguson tells us that Sterne was born in 1713—just 124 years before this debate. This is of course, correct, and he died in 1768. Now, I will leave Mr. Ferguson to explain how it was, that if Sterne were the original author of the Curse, how was it, that it was published in other books more than *one hundred years before Sterne was born*? But this will no doubt, be an easy task to one who can prove from the Scriptures the Infallibility of the Pope. He may, perhaps, get over it in a way a certain writer did, who was accused of

plagiarism, in giving as his own what was a quotation from Shakespeare—he said, “It is original with us both, all the difference is, that Shakespeare had it first.” So it must have been original with both the Council of Trent and Sterne, only the Council had it first.

I shall here mention, that the Curse, as published in the *Times*, as you, Mr. Editor, will remember, was copied from the *Cincinnati Christian Review*, and you remember that it was also published in the *Hamilton Spectator*, one of the most respectable journals in Ontario. I am also informed by a gentleman of high standing here, that this same Curse of the Pope against the King of Italy, was published in the *London Times*, with an editorial of scathing sarcasm! and I presume Mr. Ferguson will hardly have the temerity to charge the editors of the leading journal of Europe with want of scholarship, nor I presume the editor of the *Hamilton Spectator*, nor the President of Bethany College, either, who are all equally guilty with myself in this matter. But please take notice, that want of scholarship, as applied to me in this case, means ignorance of the contents of the novel of “*Tristram Shandy*,” which Archbishop Purcell declares to be “one of the most grossly obscene in the English language!” If this criticism be true, what a pity it was that I had not read it more carefully, so that I might have been more competent to write upon the character and pretensions of the Church of Rome; but I do not think it was necessary that I should have read it to understand the position and foundation of the Church of Christ.

For my own part, I have always believed that a knowledge of the Bible is of more importance in aiding us to understand religious truth, and our duty to God and to our neighbor, than all the other literature of the world. It is there, and there only, that God speaks to man in reference to the great concerns of human redemption. And I have been reading and studying this Book with less or more attention for fifty years, and I am now, if possible, more than ever convinced of the truth of the memorable utterance of Paul, 2 Timothy, iii., 16, 17: “All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” That the man of God may be perfect. But it seems from the teaching of Rome, that God has miscalculated the means for that end, and it remained for the Infallible Pontiff to supply what was wanting, and to inform the world that faith in himself and obedience to his authority are necessary to make the man of God perfect.

Thus, in the prophetic language of Paul, 2 Thes., ii. 4: “He opposes and exalteth himself above all that is called God, and is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.” But I have not so learned Christ as to submit to such assumption, although in doing so I should have the countenance and company of Father Ferguson’s “two hundred and fifty millions!” But again, I would say in the language of Paul, Romans iii. “Let God be true, but every man a liar.”

Again, in reference to that Curse, I would ask Mr. Ferguson, as he denies that it is genuine, to let us have a certified copy of the true one that the Pope uses in inflicting the greater excommunication, for no one doubts that he did issue it against Victor Emmanuel. There must be a real countenance, before it can be caricatured. There must be an original book, before it can be travestied. There

must be a true coin before there can be a counterfeit; and there never was a forgery upon a bank until genuine bills were issued. So let us have the original that we may see how far it is free from "obscenity and blasphemy," and how far it will illustrate and establish the fact, stated by Mr. Ferguson in his celebrated Lecture, that "the Pope is a kind and genial old man, whom everybody loves."

But that everybody loves him, is pretty well illustrated already by the fact that in 1848 he had to fly to Naples to escape from the *love* of his subjects, who were at the same time the homestead flock of sheep and lambs whom he was empowered as the successor of Peter to rule and to feed; and it required ten thousand French bayonets to reinstate him on his Pontifical throne, and they had to remain there over twenty years to protect him from the love of that same flock, who would otherwise have butted him over and trampled upon him, or obliged him again to fly. But, although he was all this time "toppling upon the pinnacle of his greatness" he abated none of his pretensions. But his assumption culminated last year, when the Ecumenical Council proclaimed the Infallibility Dogma, at the same time cursing all who reject it. But this had scarcely been done when both he and his Imperial protector were deposed and uncrowned.

Mr. Ferguson, in his Lecture, seems to think that the Pope owed no gratitude to Louis Napoleon for twenty-two years protection, who deserved and received the judgment of God because he withdrew his army from Rome to aid in the terrible struggle in which he was just being engaged. But if he deserves the vengeance of God because he protected the Pope only twenty-two years, what do the other Catholic powers of Europe deserve who made no effort to supply the want of that protection, so long given by the eldest son of the Church.

Is it not a fact, pregnant with *ominous meaning*, that all the Catholic powers, once so mighty and so subservient to the Pope, were either so crippled or cowed that they *could* not or *dared* not protect him, or so indifferent to his fall that they *would* not; and had not Victor Emmanuel, whom he had cursed, taken possession of Rome and its territory, and by this means protected him from the vengeance of those from whom he had fled in the habiliments of a menial some twenty-two years before, in all probability the chair of St. Peter would have been vacant, and the Cardinals scattered, so that they could not have met in the election chamber of the Vatican to make another Pope.

As I presume that Father Ferguson will think that this letter is long enough, I shall now close, as I find by your last issue that you have another letter from him, to which, I presume, I shall have to pay the usual attention.

Yours truly,

W. A. STEPHENS.

P.S.—If you have room for it, please, by way of postscript, print the following:—

THE POPE INFALLIBLE.

Rome conquered the world, to rule and to *fleece* her,
The Senate then made a God of their Cæsar—
They made him Divine, and then, as in justice,
Decreed Divine honors and worshipped Augustus.
Their example is follow'd by Rome, now Papistical,
So old and so great, so rich and so mystical—

In the name, as they say, of the glorious Trinity,
The senate of Bishops have made a Divinity:

Hoping to place the world under his rod,
Who sits now as God, in the temple of God—
Commanding the world to submit and come under
The power of his mighty Pontifical thunder!
And to say, when he speaks, or in blessing or ban,
"Tis the voice of a God, and not of a man!"

There was one who received such applause from a host,*
He was eaten of worms, and then gave up the ghost;
This fearful example a warning I'd make
To those who such blasphemy utter or take.

High Clergy were brought from Beersheeba and Dan—
And then, in the Hall of the great Vatican,
Some four hundred Fallibles made an *Infallible*!
And the Catholic faith is so plastic and malleable,
It accepts it as true—though it would not be greater
For four hundred creatures to make a Creator.

LETTER No. 5 OF MR. STEPHENS.

(From "*Owen Sound Times*" of March 24th, 1871.)

To the Editor of the Times:

DEAR SIR,—Mr. Ferguson says, "We suppose we must answer the *theology* of Mr. Stephens' letter, not because it contains a single statement of any weight against our views, but because if we do not notice it, he might think it a difficulty for us." Now, when I wrote my letter, I did not suppose that Mr. Ferguson or any of the advocates of Romanism, would, or *dare* admit any statement in my letter, or in any other letter that ever has been or ever shall be written, did or will contain anything of any weight against their views. I have long known the course and character of this class too well to expect anything like this. To preserve their prestige and influence, requires that they should not do it; and this claim to Infallibility places them in such a position that they *dare* not do it; for, of course, there can be nothing wrong in what is perfect, nothing untrue in what is infallible—as they claim their Church to be. Men who are untrammelled by an Infallible system, and do not claim that they have the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, can examine evidence and argument, and like the noble disciples at Berea (Acts xvii. 11), can accept them if they are sound and true.

Mr. Ferguson denies that he wished the audience to take for granted that the Pope is the successor of St. Peter, as I stated in my stricture upon his Lecture. That whole Lecture was based upon the assumption that the Pope is the successor of St. Peter, for it was on that and that alone that he founded the Infallible Dogma, as do all Romanists. He tells us also that "argument of whatever kind was neither attempted or thought of" in his Lecture. Did he not say "It is made an *argument* against Infallibility that Peter denied his

*Acts xlii.

Master?" and did he not then make a statement for the purpose of shewing that this argument had no validity? Is there no attempt at argument of any kind here? Did he not say "We claim that the Pontiffs of the Jewish Church were endowed with freedom from doctrinal error?" and thence draws the inference that to that purer Church which our Saviour instituted, a like power should be given. Is there no argument of any kind here?

I stated in my first letter, that Mr. Ferguson was wrong in saying that the Pontiffs of the Jewish Church were preserved from *doctrinal error*; and I gave for proof the golden calf of Aaron, and the decision of the High Priest in Mark xiv. 20; and although Mr. Ferguson has not had the honesty to admit his error, it is consoling that he has not had the mendacity to deny it. He says "Poor Mr. Stephens is happily oblivious of the ponderous volumes that have left the momentous question still unsettled." That is the Infallibility of the Pope, which he admits then is *still unsettled*. I feel *happy*, indeed, that although *Papery* may require its votaries to wade through these ponderous volumes, *Christianity* does not. Its Author has given us but *one* volume, and he tells us by his Apostle Paul (2 Tim. iii. 15), that it is able to make wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. What do we want more than this religiously, than to be made *wise unto salvation*? "The words that I speak shall judge you at the last day." Of what value, then, at that assize, will be the words of Pope or Conclave, when the Judge shall say (Matt. xxv.), I was hungry, and ye fed me; naked, and ye clothed me; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me. As to the term or title "Vicar of Christ," which Mr. Ferguson tries to explain and defend, I once for all say, that neither it, nor Pope nor Pontiff, nor universal Bishop, were ever given or taken by the authority of Christ or his apostles; and therefore the names and office are alike devoid of divine sanction, and cannot be admitted as necessary in the Church of Christ.

Mr. Ferguson pretends to put what he calls my "clumsy statement" into logical shape, and calls it my wild nonsense, and exclaims, "Shades of Aristotle, what logic!" I would ask what that old heathen has to do with settling any doctrine of Christian faith? For, although he stood high in the ranks of those whom the Apostle says "by wisdom knew not God," yet the Professor of St. Michael's College must know, that although his *science*, falsely so called, controlled and entrained the learned world for more than a decade of centuries, yet the inductive philosophy of Bacon and others have broken down the ancient and once splendid fabric, and scattered it as metaphysical chaff to the winds. I thank Mr. Ferguson for introducing Aristotle, as his case illustrates and foreshadows the fate that is to overtake the papacy, notwithstanding its splendor, its numerical power, its gorgeous temples, its despotism, and its two hundred and fifty millions, it will be scattered by the inductive philosophy of the Bible, for the Lord has said He will consume it with the spirit of his mouth (which is the word of God), and destroy it with the brightness of his coming!

In religious matters, I care nothing for the logic of Aristotle or any one else unless it is based upon the Bible. Give me the logic of Paul, a Peter, or any of the Apostles and Prophets, for it is on these that the Church is built (Ephes. ii. 20), Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.

Mr. Ferguson says that I have, in my "slovenly and lumbering

production, dragged in enough for twenty folio volumes of controversy." He has not said that I have over-stated, over-coloured, or exaggerated anything in what I say that the Pope claims from the words spoken to Peter, "I will give unto thee the Keys," &c.; and I have no doubt but it would take twenty folio volumes twenty times told to prove that those claims have any foundation in Scripture or in truth.

Mr. Ferguson says I "may be a very Goliath in scripture and reasoning." I don't think that Mr. Goliath was much given to scripture or reasoning either, so I am not very ambitious to be like him in those things. He says that if I were twenty times the genius that I am, or think myself to be, he would still consider himself justified in holding his own views, not because they are his own, but because (he finds them clearly stated in the New Testament?) O no! he dares not say that, "but because I find them advocated and maintained by men so much superior to both of us, that they could roll up some scores of us in the corner of their pocket handkerchief, nor know that we, poor little things were there." The Apostle Paul tells every man "to think of himself soberly," and we must presume that Father Ferguson has done so in this marvellous humility and abnegation of himself.

It was said by Robert Burns, to a crowd who were denouncing the meanness of a gentleman, who gave only a shilling to a man who had just saved him from drowning: "The gentleman is surely the best judge of the value of his own life," so we must allow Mr. Ferguson to be the best judge of his own calibre; but for my own part, I confess that I am not able to assume such microscopic proportions, and I shall allow him to be put into the handkerchief of one of these giants alone; and so, now that he is in it, this giant puts it into his pocket, and the first time that he has occasion to use it, not knowing that this "poor little thing is there," it suddenly finds itself in the midst of a nasal monsoon, and in a worse predicament than Gulliver, when stuck by the Brobdignagian Princess into a marrow bone!

But to be serious, is it possible that this eloquent Lecturer can be serious himself, when he says that he is so immeasurably inferior to those great Doctors of his Church, who, I presume, have written many of those ponderous volumes that he speaks of, and are among the canonised saints of the Roman calendar. If this be so, I do not wonder that he should look upon them as objects of adoration.

I may say here, that I feel, religiously, to be far superior to any man, if it should be Pope Pius himself, who could so degrade himself as to bow to an image, or pray to any saint! What! a man made in the image of God! to worship any being lower than his Creator! And what is more terribly degrading still, a man made in the image of God to worship or pray to an image of a fellow image. When Cornelius (Acts x. 25,) had fallen down to worship Peter, with what sudden earnestness he said, "Stand up, I also am a man;" and if he were living now, how he would speak in words of indignant reproach to the two hundred and fifty millions who Father Ferguson says bow at his shrine: "Stand up, I also am a man!" And if Peter, who, as Catholics say, was the Vicar of Christ, the supreme Pontiff and universal Bishop of the Church, refused such homage in his living person, standing there as one of the most honored images of God, would not his indignant abhorrence have been increased a hundred

told if they had made an image of himself and placed it in the Church and bowed down before it. O, how degrading to man and dishonoring to God, this praying to saints and bowing down to images! The Almighty said, (Exodus xx.) amid the terrible thunders of Mount Sinai: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image. Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them and serve them." And not only did He *say* this, but He also *wrote* it in duplicate with His finger upon tables of stone. But Rome says, "Thou shalt make unto thee graven images; thou shalt bow down unto them."

And now I would tell you, *Catholic layman, what your Priests have never told you, and what none of you, I presume, are well enough acquainted with the Bible to know, without being told, that there is no instance in the Bible where any but an Idolater bowed down to an image; or worshipped or prayed to any one, excepting God. Cornelius, as we have seen, attempted to worship Peter, and John attempted to worship an angel (Rev. xix. 10); but as in the case of Peter, how prompt and decided was the response, as John himself records it: "See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren who have the testimony of Jesus: *worship God*." And see also (Judges xiii. 15, 20,) the case of the father of Sampson and the angel of the Lord, who forbade Manoah to offer a sacrifice to him, but said, "Thou must offer it to the Lord." And when the disciples said, "Lord, teach us how to pray;" how did He do it? It was to "Our Father, which art in Heaven." There are no *Ave Marias* in the book of God. And Jesus said, just before his crucifixion (John xvi. 23), "Whatsoever ye ask the *Father* in my name, *He* will give it you." And the Apostle James says, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of *God*, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." And no name is authorised by God to be used as a Mediator between God and man, but the One man, Christ Jesus. How much more glorious and solemn is the act and privilege of prayer, when offered direct to the Ear of the Eternal, who has told us that He *can* and *will* hear; than to have it frittered away among dead saints, however holy they were when living or happy when dead, especially when we have no authority from the Scriptures for believing that they know anything about us; and if they do, are our prayers any clearer to the mind of God, because they go second hand to Him? or will He be any more disposed to grant our petitions, than if they go direct from the heart and lips of the believer in God and in Christ Jesus?

And I will tell you another thing, which may surprise you, and

*It has been looked upon, I was told by a Catholic acquaintance, as a great piece of presumption in me, to presume to know what the Priests do or do not tell the people; but I would ask him, or any other Catholic layman, if the Priests had ever told them any of these things that I have here taken for granted, from the very nature of things, that they would not and did not tell them? And I would now ask them also, in connection with the practice in their Church, of desecrating the tombs of the most honored saints, by robbing them of their bones and calling them sacred relics, if the Priests have ever told them that the only passage in the New Testament where dead men's bones are spoken of, is Matt. xxiii. 27: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of *dead men's bones* and all uncleanness!" And this is all the authority they have from Scripture to carry on this Priestly traffic in these loathsome relics!

which your Priests have never told you, that there was no order of *Priests* in the Church of Christ in the days of the Apostles. The only one spoken of in the New Testament as a Priest in His Church is Jesus Himself, who is said (Hebrews v. 10) to be "called of God a High Priest after the order of Melchisedec, and is also said to be "The High Priest of our profession." "And there is nothing hid from the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." And Peter, who ought to be good authority with Catholics, told all the Christians to whom he wrote (Peter i. 2, 9,) that they were an *holy Priesthood*, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, (not by any saint); and again, he tells all the Christians (9th verse), "Ye are a *Royal Priesthood*, an holy nation," &c. But in defiance of these words of Peter (who, you will all admit as well as I, was infallible), your Priests have monopolised the name as belonging only to themselves, when it was given by God to all Christians. And as there were no Priests then as a class, there was and could be no private confession to, or forgiveness of sins by them.

And I will tell you another thing which your Priests have never told you, that although the name of Mary, the mother of Jesus, is repeated so many hundred times in your Prayer Book, she is never mentioned but once in the New Testament after the resurrection of the Lord. And is it not passing strange that, if she was appointed by the Almighty to occupy such an important place in Heaven and the Church of Christ, as the Pope says she does, the Apostles, who were commanded to teach all nations, were so recreant to their duty as never once to mention her name in any of their recorded sermons, epistles or prophecies! much less to pray to or ask her intercession!!

Mr. Ferguson says that he does not intend to take any more notice of anything I may write. What a pity that we shall not have the privilege of hearing from him again, as he has so much to be proud of in his last letter, with which I have not yet done; but hope to be able to finish my remarks, Mr. Editor, in your next issue; and I may perhaps as well state here, that a merchant in this town, who is a man of fine literary taste and possessed of clear critical acumen, said to me, after reading the above letter: "You did wrong in your reply to Spencer to admit that Ferguson is a gentleman!!"

W. A. STEPHENS.

LETTER No. 6 OF MR. STEPHENS.

(From "*Owen Sound Times*" of March 31st, 1871.)

To the Editor of the Times:

DEAR SIR,—In my last letter I made some remarks upon the worship of images and saints; and in addition, I would here mention that the term or title saint, never occurs in the New Testament as addressed to or spoken of an individual, and therefore it is never used in the singular number—although in the plural (saints) it occurs 57 times, and is always used as synonymous with *believers*, disciples, or christians. I shall quote three passages, which will be sufficient to confirm what I say, and which has only to be stated, to be acknowledged by any student of the Bible: Acts xxii. 19—Paul says, "Lord, they know that I beat and imprisoned in every synagogue them that believe on Thee." Acts xxvi. 10—Paul again says, this time addressing

Agrippa, "Many of the *saints* did I shut up in prison." And Ananias said, in referring to Paul, "Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy *saints* in Jerusalem." Acts ix. 13.

According to the New Testament, a man was numbered among the *saints* as soon as, upon his confession and baptism, he was added to the Church. How is it now in the Catholic Church? None are *saints*, I understand, but those who are publicly declared to be such, or are canonised by the Pope. And some, at least have had a long time to wait for their installation. Witness Columbus, who, it is said, has lately been declared a saint by Pope Pius. Columbus died 364 years ago. And is it not passing strange, that none of the twenty or thirty *Infallible* Popes who have reigned since then, ever discovered that he was a saint until now. Taking for granted that the Catholic dogma relating to *saints* is true, it is hard to estimate the loss which Catholics have sustained for want of the intercession of Saint Columbus during 360 years!

I presume that it was because he had discovered the continent of America that he has been canonized. There is another greater and more wonderful discoverer than Columbus, who certainly ought to be made a saint, if he has not been. I don't know his name, and Mr. Ferguson may exclaim about my ignorance in this matter; but I do not think his name is in "Tristram Shandy." I mean the man who first discovered the continent of Purgatory!! It was certainly not known to any of the Prophets or Apostles, as that country or place is never mentioned in the Bible; but this is of no consequence to Rome, as this continent is a source of large revenue to the Priesthood, who say masses for the dead, who, they tell us, are its only inhabitants.* Mr. Ferguson says in his letter that I am now reviewing, "I simply claim the right of possession,"—that is, of all that is claimed by the Church of Rome. Now, although we dispute its monopoly of the Kingdom of Heaven, we have no hesitation in admitting her claims to undisputed dominion in Purgatory, on the right of *first discovery*.

Mr. Ferguson refers again to Peter having the keys. My poem published in the *Times*, in connection with this controversy, shows how Peter used the keys. He (Mr. F.) defends the right to cut off, to curse, and to anathematise whatever (*whoever*, I presume he means) is false; and quotes Matthew xviii. 18, "And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen man and the publican." He cites from the Douay version, no doubt; but I accept it as correct, for the meaning is the same as in our own version. Now, I shall give the whole of this admirable law, of which Mr. F. has quoted only the conclusion: "Moreover, if thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear, take with thee

*I am not aware if any of the explorers of Purgatory have ever made a map of the country; but there must be, according to Catholicism, a great variety of climate, in which heat is said to predominate—reaching in its hottest regions, almost up to the fires of Hell. And I understand that it is for the exclusive use of departed Catholics, as no Protestant is allowed to enter it, much less into Heaven, as the will and pleasure of the Pope is that *they* shall all be thrust into Hell. I have never heard, however, of any Protestant complaining of being excluded from Purgatory, or expressing any intention of applying to the Pope to be allowed the privilege of going there.

one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established. And if he neglect to hear them, tell it to the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." What is there about *cursing* or *anathematizing* here?

In this matter, I would now appeal to Mr. Spencer, who came out so bravely in Mr. Ferguson's defence a short time ago. He and I have frequently examined, when sitting together as magistrates, the various Acts of Parliament relating to our duty as such; and we always agreed in this, that nothing was to be *assumed* or *taken for granted as being enacted by any statute or clause of a statute, that was not plainly expressed in it*; and consequently we never acted as if fining meant confining, or that imprisonment in the common gaol meant imprisonment in the Penitentiary, &c.; and I now ask Mr. Spencer if he can see anything to authorize to *curse* or *anathematize* in this law, the sole penalty of which is, "He shall be unto thee (the offended party) as a heathen and a publican,"—not to be any longer acknowledged by him as a brother. Instead of *cursing* the heathen and publicans, our Lord Himself, as His history shows, treated them with kindness and consideration, "leaving us an example that we should follow His steps," "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again."

Mr. F. also quotes Titus iii. 10, to show that the Church has a right to curse, "A man that is an heretic avoid;" and these are all this eloquent champion of his Church can bring from the Word of God to sustain its awful and terrible assumption of the right to *curse* all who reject her dogmas; and so far as she has the power, to open the pit of hell and drive them all into it. She assumes that these passages quoted, should read thus: If he will not hear the Church, let the Church *curse* him. An heretic, after the first and second admonition, let the Church *curse* him!

Now, before I leave this subject, I would ask—not Mr. Ferguson, for he says he will pay no more attention to what I write—but I would ask all the Catholic laymen or priests, if any of them have ever known the above law of the Lord Jesus carried out in any of their churches; or, according to their organization, if they can do it? Let us suppose a case. James, a Catholic, who has been offended by a brother Catholic, belonging to the same congregation, goes to him, and says: "John, you have offended against me by injuring my character in saying I cheated you in that horse trade, the other day. Now, the Lord Jesus says: 'If thy brother offend thee, go to him alone.' In obedience to Him, I have come to ask you to confess the injury you have done me." John replies: "I'll do no such thing; I'll make no apology, and you may do your best." James goes sorrowfully away; but remembers that the Lord further says: "Take one or two more with you, and go again." He calls upon two of the members of the church, and states the case, and they go with him, and then the cause of the offence is talked over among them, and they ask John to make amends for the injury done to James. John still refuses; and they regretting the failure of their well-meant efforts, come away; James telling John that he must now take the next step commanded by the Lord, and tell it to the church.

Now, supposing all this had occurred last week between two of the members of the Catholic Church in Owen Sound, and that last Sunday at the end of the service, James should have risen and said: "Brethren,

I have something of importance to bring before you. Something very unpleasant has occurred between me and John A., by whom I have been justly offended; but before I proceed further, I shall read the law in such cases made and provided by our Lord Jesus Christ, as contained in St. Matthew's Gospel, xviii. chapter;" and he proceeds to open the book. If he has been allowed to proceed thus far, who can imagine the surprise and wonder that would be felt by all the lay members at such an unheard-of proceeding, for one of the *laity* to dare to open his mouth in the church? And what would be the astonishment and indignation of the Priest, that one of his flock should, in defiance of the rules of the Church, and without consulting him, dare to obey the positive law of Christ, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth? Mr. Ferguson, in quoting part of the above law, admits that all of it is binding, for the same authority enacts the whole. Now, I would ask all Catholics this solemn and momentous question: Can that be a true Church of Christ, in which a member of it *cannot* and *dare not* obey his plain and positive commands?

I shall now attend to the argument of numbers, which Mr. Ferguson, both in his Lecture and in his letter, paraded with such pomp and presumed power. He says, "Surely it is wiser for me to follow them and the great majority of the Christian world, than you and the baker's dozen, relatively, who think with you. I, and two hundred and fifty millions think there was a transmission of the power of the Keys," &c. And again, "Their little, thin, puny voices, (meaning the Protestants) striving to utter their miserable 'No,' will be lost in the thunder with which two or three hundred millions living and ten thousand millions dead, who believed as we do, will reply 'Yes!'"

Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, said, about the time of the debate with A. Campbell, that the Catholics of the world numbered one hundred and fifty millions; but perhaps Mr. F. is better authority than the Archbishop, especially as he stated in the debate that he did not believe in the Infallibility of the Pope, and that he did not know any intelligent Catholic who did. This is published over his own signature, and therefore the Priests cannot say that it is a *Protestant lie*.

Now, we shall take it for granted that Father Ferguson is better authority than the Archbishop in regard to numbers, and then observe that the population of the world according to the most reliable statistics, is twelve hundred millions—thus leaving nine hundred and fifty millions who are not Catholics, who utter their unanimous *No* against the Papal assumption, and even the *Yes* of Mr. Ferguson's two hundred and fifty millions would not be very distinctly heard amid the thunder of *that No*! Now if the argument of numbers is worth anything in deciding what is truth, which I do not admit, it is more than four to one against him.

It is well observed, that *Truth has been generally in the minority* since the days of Noah, to whom God said, "Come thou into the Ark, for thee have I found righteous before me in this generation."—Noah was a preacher of righteousness, (2 Peter ii. 8,) and in reply to his preaching, we may suppose one of his neighbors would say, in speaking of Noah to his friends, "See that miserable fanatic. He has taken it into his head that all of us are to be drowned! and he and his three boys are working away at that huge building which he calls an 'ark,' in which he intends to sail upon the water when it

comes! Isn't that rich? He thinks that he knows more than all the rest of the world, including our old and mighty men of renown; and he only about five hundred years old, while many of those, are near a thousand, and old enough to be his great grandfather. We say that we are right, and the miserable feeble *No* of that half baker's dozen of Noah and his family, will be drowned in the thunder of the millions who answer "*Yes*." But this did not prevent the thunder and the waters of the deluge from drowning them and their *Yes*!

And again, there was a time when the people (Gen. xix.) said of Lot, This *one* fellow came in to sojourn amongst us, and he will need be a judge. He and his silly wife and daughters think that they are wiser and better than all the wise and the great men of the cities of the Plain. It is wiser for us to be with them, than to believe Lot's feeble and miserable *No*. Fire and brimstone from heaven was the answer of God to their profane assumption.

And again, there was once an immense crowd at the base of Mount Sinai (Exodus xxxii. 28), where there was also a golden calf, which Aaron, the High Priest had made. The miserable *No* of the faithful few was drowned by the thunder of the million who shouted "These are thy Gods, O Israel!" but that thunder was answered by the summary execution of three thousand of the Idolaters, at the command of the Lord God of Israel, by the faithful minority who had uttered that *No*.

And again, (1 Kings, xviii.) Baal's prophets were four hundred and fifty men. They had said with the multitude of Israel, by bowing their knee to him, that Baal was *God*; while the *yes* of these millions was met only by the feeble *no* of seven thousand scattered throughout the land of Israel. But one single prophet of God met those four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal upon Mount Carmel—when fire from heaven burning up his sacrifice attested the truth of Elijah, which was followed by the immediate slaughter of all the idol prophets.

And again, Daniel iii.—Perhaps the most magnificent religious festival ever witnessed in the world, took place in the plains of Dura, in the Province of Babylon, when perhaps the largest mass of gold that was ever melted was made into a golden image, 90 feet high and 9 feet wide, made and set up by the command of the mighty Nebuchadnezzar. All the princes, rulers, governors, judges, treasurers, sheriffs and councillors, of all the provinces of his mighty Empire, were thus with the multitudes of Babylon, brought by the King's decree to the dedication of this magnificent image. At the sound of all kinds of music the vast multitude by their simultaneous prostration and worship said: This is our God. There were only three who uttered a feeble *no*. The words spoken to their fathers so long before: "Thou shalt not bow down to, or serve any graven image," brought the thunder and glory of Mount Sinai before them, and threw the blackness and darkness of damning Idolatry over all this Babylonian grandeur; and they stood erect, despite the wrath of the mighty and terrible king, the example of the multitude, and the terrors of the furnace of fire, into which they knew they must be thrown! They replied to the King: "Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace. But if not, be it known, O King, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the image which thou hast set up." One like unto the Son of God was in the furnace to protect them, and made its fiery

blast like a summer breeze; and how honored has been and will be through all time, this glorious minority of three! And in this same country there was the minority of *one* who dared the terrors of the Lion's den, rather than renounce the God of his fathers, by even seeming to abstain from his accustomed worship.

Now let us come to the second volume of Revelation, and we see Jesus, the Nazarene; the raging multitude headed by the priests cried out: He is a blasphemer, let him be crucified. The feeble *no* of his terrified disciples was drowned in the thunder of the *yes* of his ruthless murderers. But in spite of all this God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name, and to him every knee shall bow to the glory of God the Father. And again, the martyr Stephen, (Acts vii.) singly and alone avowed and defended his faith in that crucified Nazarene, against his maddened murderers, who now surrounded himself. Oh, the matchless glory of that hour when he saw "Jesus standing at the right hand of God," and told his enemies what he saw! Jesus, it would seem, had stood up and looked down from heaven to encourage his faithful disciple, whose spirit he was so soon to receive in accordance with his prayer. And we all remember (Acts xix.) when the pretended Pagan piety of Demetrius the silversmith, roused the thunder of the thousands of Ephesians, who cried out in a two hours' vociferous repetition: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" which for a time drowned the feeble *no* of the disciples of Jesus; but that *yes* was the fabrication of priestly imposture—and that *no* the utterance of eternal truth. And we all remember the solemn words of Him who spoke as never man spake, "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." I think I have now said enough to convince even Mr. Ferguson that in matters of religion, at least, even very large majorities are not always infallible.

Mr. Ferguson says to me, "quit your noisy, insulting language until you have something better to give me than the mere word of yourself." I really thought that I had in my letter he refers to quoted some passages of scripture and based all my argument and statements upon the authority of the word of God; but he tells me here that I have given the mere word of myself! Although this is said by the redoubtable Father Ferguson, can even Catholics believe it? He certainly does not, and cannot believe it himself; and I must admire the audacity of this pert young priest in ordering me to quit writing, as if I were one of his pupils, or as if he had the Inquisition at his back. I said in the beginning of this controversy that Mr. Ferguson was both pleasant and plausible, and so he was in our Town Hall, when he was face to face with some hundreds of intelligent Protestants, whom he hoped to hoodwink by his *sophistry*; but now when he finds his attempt is an utter failure, his pleasant plausibility has vanished, leaving not a wreck behind. He says also: "On you, as the attacking party, rests the burden of proving me wrong." If there is any reliance in logic; any force in argument; any truth in scripture—it is the opinion of this community that I have done it, that I have proved him wrong; and they will hold this opinion until he shows that my quotations of scripture are untrue, my logic is false, and my argument therefore unsound.

As I have been urged to republish this controversy in pamphlet form, which I intend doing, it will take one or two more letters

further to illustrate the subject, in order still more clearly to show that this system called Catholicity has no claim to any part of the Kingdom of Heaven of which Peter had the Keys, much less to its entire monopoly.

W. A. STEPHENS.

[We are always willing to allow the use of our columns for fair controversy on any of the topics of the day, be they political, religious, or otherwise, as must be evident from the space we have given to the present discussion; but it is evident the *controversy* on this point is ended—indeed, Mr. Stephens has been allowed several letters since the gentleman on the other side announced his intention of writing no more*—and if Mr. Stephens now, with no pretence of controversy, desires to go on writing with the intention of publishing a book against Popery, we think the columns of a secular newspaper hardly the place for it.—ED. TIMES.]

CONTINUATION OF THE ARGUMENT BY MR. STEPHENS.

In my last letter to the *Times*, notwithstanding the orders given me by Mr. Ferguson to stop my writing, I intimated my intention of resuming the subject at issue between us. In his letter which I am still considering, he speaks of those who oppose the assumption of the Papal Church, as being like a swine which he saw at Quebec, rising from the gutter and rubbing its itching back against the mighty citadel. Thus, we Protestants, "rising from the quagmire of heresy, rub against a buttress of the old Church, and bring into disrepute some of the grand old dogmas, that, revealed by Christ and interpreted by Catholicity, have consoled the saints and christianized mankind."

In this controversy, I referred to a good many of what he calls grand old *dogmas* revealed by Christ. I confess, however, I think it irreverent to speak of the *dogmas* of Christ. How would it sound in the ears of any one who reverences the Word of God, to read, "He that heareth these *dogmas* of mine, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like," &c.; or, "The *dogmas* that I speak shall judge you at the last day;" or, "He that keepeth my *dogmas*, he it is that loveth me;" or, in His great commission to the apostles, "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all my *dogmas*." No! this term, as applied to the teaching and commands of Christ, savors too much of the "interpretations of Catholicity" to be agreeable to a Christian ear, or to be tolerated by a Christian heart. I wish it here to be understood, that no one can be a Christian, in the Christian sense of that term, who prays to, or worships any one lower than Christ Himself, who has all power in heaven and earth, and who is to be the Judge of the living and the dead.

I have referred to many of the grand old *truths* revealed, and *commands* given by Christ, and I would ask Mr. Ferguson, or (as he says he will not answer) any one else, to lay his finger on any one of these I have tried to bring into disrepute; for if I had no love or reverence for His name, the solemn and abiding conviction, that His word will judge me at the last day, would prevent my doing so. "God com-

*My three last letters were published after Mr. Ferguson's two, so that I had actually only one letter more than he in the regular run of the controversy.

mands thee always for thy good." "He that hath my word, let him speak my word; what is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord."—Jer. xxiii. 28. "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my thoughts higher than your thoughts;" (Isa. lv.) and all we know of the thoughts of God are what he has expressed in words. "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." And in searching the Scriptures, I have endeavored to do so, not for the purpose of finding something to support my own views, either individual or denominational, but for the purpose of finding what the Scriptures say, that I may have an intelligent faith, resting not "in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God;" and I have tried to keep down any desire that the Scriptures should say anything else than what they do say on any subject, either of fact, faith or duty. And I hold it to be a truth that cannot be questioned, without dishonoring God and endangering the safety of man, that it is worse in God's sight to do anything that *He has forbidden*, than anything else that *any one else* has forbidden; and that it is more pleasing in His sight to do anything *He* has commanded, than to do anything else that *any one else* has commanded. And no human testimony, however strong, and no argument, however specious, can warrant us in either distrusting or disobeying him.

Now, viewing the subjects at issue between Christianity and Popery in the light of the above proposition, which no *Priest* or *Professor* can successfully deny, what havoc it makes of the ritual of Romanism! For all the prayers, to all the saints, that were ever offered, by all the Catholics that ever lived, cannot be of as much value in the sight of God, as one true prayer, offered by a Christian, to Himself, in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ; for He has not commanded us to ask Him anything in any *other name*; and "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," Acts iv. 12.

And what becomes of all the prayers, of all the Priests, for all the pay that has so enriched the Papacy, for the purpose of passing the souls of Parishioners and Priests, and even Popes themselves, out of Purgatory! And what, also, becomes of all the *holy water* that has been sprinkled; and all the *incense* that has been burned; the *crucifixes* that have been worn or kissed; the *relics* that have been adored; the *pilgrimages* that have been made; of all the *indulgences* that have been purchased; of all the *candles* that have been lighted in the daytime as part of worship; of all the *monasteries* and *nunneries*, with the ascetic lives of their inmates? Who hath required these things at your hands? God has not; we have neither command nor example from the Lord or any of his apostles for *any of these things*. But they all have come by the "interpretations [and interpolations] of Catholicity"—yes, these terrible, these fearful "interpretations of Catholicity." "I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me those words."

I have shown in "that long, clumsy sentence," in my first letter, (which Mr. Ferguson found so awkward a thing to grapple with,) what the interpretation of Catholicity did with the saying of the Lord to Peter, "I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom." Catholicity has endeavored to make our Lord responsible for, as authorizing all those fearful departures from the truth, which I exhibited and gibbeted in that letter.

"To the Law and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no *light* in them."—Isa. viii. 20.

As none of these things are among the commands of God, they must all be merely the commands of men. And our Lord has said (Matt. xv. 9), "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." But Catholics get out of this, they think, by saying they are the commands of the Church; and they try to fortify this position by the passage at the close of a law, quoted by me in full, in my last letter: "If he will not hear the *Church*, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." This is the only passage in the Scriptures where it speaks of any one being obliged to hear the Church, and this is only in carrying out a distinct law, *just then given*. But the "interpretation of Catholicity" makes this passage give the power to the Clergy to force all within the Papal pale, upon the pains of eternal damnation, to obey all the laws which they may think for the interest of their order to enact; and the Catholic laity, usually, if not always, give as a reason for doing anything religiously, "It is the rule of the Church;" and for not doing anything, "It is against the rules of the Church." When do you hear a Catholic say, "I do such or such a thing, because it is commanded in the Word of God." If he prays to the saints—it's the rule of the Church; if he counts his beads—it's the rule of the Church; if he says his *Ave Maria*—it's the rule of the Church; if he refuses to eat meat on Friday—it's the rule of the Church; and if he fasts on some saint's day—its the rule of the Church, which takes upon itself (as was prophesied by Paul it would) to command to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving.—1 Tim. iii. 4. Some of their *fasts*, it must be admitted, are not very *grievous*, for I met a Catholic once at an hotel, and while at dinner he was careful to draw our attention to the circumstance that he ate no meat, and said, "This is one of the *Fast days of our Church*, but," he added, "I'll take a double supply of *pudding*." He did not "disfigure his face," or put on "a sad countenance," to let us know he was fasting, like the ancient Pharisees, but he took care to tell us of it. I do not think he received much glory from men at that time, at least, in consequence of his abstinence.

I may here observe that there is no authority given in the New Testament, (which contains the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and which makes free from the law of sin and death,) to authorize any man, or body of men, to *force* any one to *fast*, although any one may do it voluntarily; and we know that the disciples did not fast while the Lord was with them.—Luke v. 44. We have, it is true, several examples of some of the Apostles and first Christians fasting; but in doing it, they did not quote the rule of the Church as a reason, and then it was evidently *entire abstinence* from food—as the meaning of the word itself implies. I may here observe again, that there is no command in the New Testament to fast—every individual Christian is left to decide how long, and at what particular time he ought to abstain from food; although Rome teaches, as it was lately observed by a speaker in Montreal, that "it is worse to eat honest mutton on Friday, than to steal a sheep on Sunday."

To be a true Christian, a man must know what the Lord has commanded, and then believe and obey Him; to be a true Roman Catholic, all that is necessary, is to obey the rules of the Church, without the privilege of examining whether they are right or wrong—for the right of private judgment is denied.

"Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord." The interpretation of Catholicity is, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay," saith the Church, or the Pope, who is its head—and he is, no doubt, the true head of that Church. But to make the Lord Jesus responsible for having appointed him, is one of the most terrible interpretations of Catholicity. The Scriptures say, (2 Tim. ii. 4, 5,) "A Bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife." "One that rules well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how can he take care of the Church of God?" And again, (Titus i. 8,) speaking of appointing Elders, "If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly." Now, the interpretation of Catholicity is, "A Bishop shall not have a wife," and therefore, that he shall not have any children; and in consequence, he shall not be able to give that evidence of fitness for the Bishop's office, which the Word of God positively requires. And not only this, but he must take a solemn oath, when first made a Priest, that he never will take a wife. You see here, how the authority of the Church is placed above the authority of God, by the interpretations of Catholicity, as to the Priests, as there are no Priests in the Churches founded by the Apostles; there is nothing said, of course, whether they should marry or not. As to monks or nuns, as the Scripture knows nothing about them either, there is nothing said about whether they should marry or not. But the Word of God says, Let marriage be honorable in all; but the interpretation of Catholicity says, "Let marriage not be honorable in all."

The Scripture says, (James v. 16,) "Confess your faults one to another." The interpretation of Catholicity on this passage is, "Confess your sins to the Priest." You must turn your soul inside out to the gaze of one, whose own soul, for ought you know, may be black with secret pollution, as some of the Priests at least, have been known to be. What a fearful power this gives the clergy over the laity! and if we believe the revelations of those Priests who have broken loose from Rome, it is most terrible, and often fatal to the innocence and purity of the confessing females, as the natural result of such unrestrained intercourse. The Scripture says, "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and every woman have her own husband;" but the interpretation of Catholicity denies this safeguard against impurity to all the above classes. Some find fault with the Scriptures for speaking in plain language about natural things. Whoever you are that does so, have you considered what this objection involves? It is this: that you are wiser than God! that the words of the Holy Spirit are not sufficiently refined to suit your fastidious ears! In our Legislative enactments, in the investigations of our Courts of law, in our books upon medical science and the prevention of disease, it is found necessary to speak in plain language of such things; and is it less necessary in the statute book of Heaven; in the judicial decisions of the Judge of all the earth; in the volume given by the Great Physician of souls—to speak of things as they are? and what daring assumption is it for men to find fault! I may here state a fact, that perhaps everybody has not observed, that no apostle, prophet, evangelist, teacher, bishop or deacon, during the lifetime of our Lord or his Apostles, were ever required to take an oath or vow of any kind, either before or after his appointment to office. But the interpretations

and interpolations of *Catholicity*, command every one, male or female, appointed to any office, or on becoming connected with any ecclesiastical or religious order, to take an oath of celibacy and of obedience to their ecclesiastical superiors. I have just read the oath of a Bishop, and in it he swears obedience in all things to his *Lord the Pope*, and to persecute and destroy heretics, &c. There is nothing in the oath, however, about obedience to the laws of Christ Jesus. And there is no instance in the Scriptures, of any one being required to take a vow or oath in becoming a Christian—a simple confession of faith and obedience to the Gospel, was all that was required. The only oath recorded in the Word of God, connected with the Kingdom of Heaven, of which Peter had the Keys, is in Heb. vii. 21, as quoted from the 110th Psalm, "The Lord sware, and He will not repent, Thou art an High Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec;" and here the oath was taken, not by Christ, who was appointed High Priest, but by God the Father, who appointed Him.

The Lord Jesus, on the night in which He was betrayed, took bread and gave thanks, and brake and gave to the disciples, and said "This is my body, given for you." He also took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to the disciples, saying "Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, shed for many, for remission of sins."—Matt. xxvi. 26. And Paul, (1 Cor. xi.) after speaking of the institution, says, "He that eateth the *bread* or drinketh the *cup* of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the *body* and *blood* of the Lord." Now this was not said to any particular class in the Church, but to all the Church in Corinth, (1st chap. ver. 2, 3,) "with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." Now the interpretation of *Catholicity* is, "None but the Clergy shall drink of the *cup* of the Lord." Is it because the Clergy like wine so much themselves that they can't spare any of it for the laity? or is it for fear that they might drink it unworthily, and be guilty of the blood of the Lord, and therefore they drink all the wine themselves to keep the flock from being guilty?

Now, can any man who knows anything of the character and dignity of Christ, believe that He gave the power to any man or set of men to repeal any of the laws of His kingdom, and to violate His most solemn and sacred commands. If he did do this, then Christ is divided against Himself, and His kingdom cannot stand; and what He said (John xii. 48,) "he that rejecteth me and heareth not my words, hath one that judgeth him. The words that I speak shall judge him in the last day," should have been, according to the interpretation of *Catholicity*, "The words of the successors of Peter shall judge him in the last day." And if the interpretation of *Catholicity* is true, Christ also gave the power to the Pope to repeal one of the Ten Commandments, given by Jehovah on Mount Sinai, and written with his finger on stone, which I referred to in a former letter, and which is the second commandment, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in the heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." How terribly the saying of Paul is verified: "He exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." Christ says: "Drink ye all of it." The Pope says: "The laity shall not drink of it." The Holy Spirit says, by Paul: "A Bishop must be the husband of one

wife." The Pope says: "He shall not have a wife." Jehovah says: "Thou shalt not bow down to any graven image." The Pope says: "Thou shalt do it." Thus, in defiance of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit—all that is called God—he keeps wives from the Bishops; the cup from the laity; and gives graven images to both.

I. Corinthians xi. 24, we are told that "the Lord Jesus, on the night in which he was betrayed, took bread [or a loaf], and when He had given thanks, He said 'Take eat, this is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me.'" And the Apostle adds, in the 26th verse, "As often as ye eat of this *bread* and drink of this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." Here observe that Paul speaks of it as *bread* before the Lord gave thanks; and calls it still *bread* after the thanks were given. The interpretation of Catholicity is: You shall not take bread, and break it, and give a piece to each of the congregation; but the Priest shall take a wafer for each of the communicants,—and that the Pope gives the power to each of the 40,000 of his Priests to change each of these wafers into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of the Lord Jesus Christ; and thus on each *sacrament* time, to work miracles upon the Creator; to make each of these wafers an individual God, to be masticated and swallowed by the worshippers. I would ask how long these wafers continue to be, after they are eaten, "the body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus," and when do these attributes pass away from the persons of the faithful Catholics? This interpretation of Catholicity is so horrible and impious that it is almost too revolting to describe it.

In support of this dogma of the *Church*, they quote John vi. 53, &c: "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," &c. Many of the disciples understanding this literally, said "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" Jesus corrected their misapprehension in the 63rd verse: "The *flesh* profiteth nothing, the words that I speak unto you are *spirit* and are life,"—that is: His *literal* flesh would profit *nothing to eat it*. If the Catholic dogma be true, that His flesh is literally eaten, then we must believe that Christ, (John xv. 1,) is a literal *vine*, growing in the earth and supported by a wall or trellis; and that the Apostles are literal branches. And also, (John x. 7,) we must believe that Christ is a literal door, hanging upon hinges, fastened to the walls of a literal sheep-fold. And also, that in the Great Day of Judgment, (Matt. xxv.) those on the right are to be literal sheep, and those on the left are to be literal goats. Upon the principal of this dogma, Nicodemus was right (John iii. 4,) when he asked: "How can a man be born when he is old; can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" But the Lord corrected his misapprehension, (as he did his disciples', in reference to *eating* his flesh,) by informing Nicodemus that the birth he spoke of was "of water and the Spirit," for what is born of the flesh is flesh—so that if it were possible to repeat the natural birth, it would still be a fleshly one, and only produce as before a fleshly being.

As to Transubstantiation—in this the Priests claim the power to do what was never given to the Apostles, that of changing one substance into another: for in the list of miracles which the Lord empowered the Apostles to do, when He sent them on their mission to preach, saying, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," (Matt. x. 8,) He empowered them by His word to heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse

the lepers, cast out devils; He did not add: "change one substance into another." This He did only once Himself, when, in Cana of Galilee, (John ii.) He made water into wine. Then the water ceased to be water, and had all the qualities—both to eye and taste—of genuine and good wine, for the Governor of the feast said when partaking of it: "You have kept the good wine until now." If it had continued to look like water, to taste like water, and when taken into the stomach effected the drinker just as water did, who would or could have believed it to be wine? and such a miracle could not have "manifested forth His glory," as John said this miracle did. Now, if the Papal Dogma is true, that the wafer is changed into the actual flesh and blood of Jesus, then it must look like blood and taste like blood—and human blood, too—and it must look like flesh and taste like flesh—and human flesh, too—or else there is no evidence to satisfy any one who dares to use his reason and senses, that the miracle has been performed—for all the miracles ever wrought by Moses or the Prophets, or by Christ or His Apostles, were obvious and evident to the senses of all who beheld them. Moses was empowered in one instance, (Exodus vii. 20,) to change one substance into another—the waters of the river of Egypt into blood, in the sight of the Egyptians; and in consequence, the fish died and the river stank. Had it looked, and tasted, and smelt like water, where would have been the evidence of the miracle; and who among either Egyptians or Israelites would have believed it?

I shall now examine, in the light of the New Testament, the *foundation* dogma of Catholicity, which affirms that the words spoken by the Saviour, (Matt. xvi. 18,) "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," made Peter the foundation, and placed the Church upon him. Now, let us take for granted that this is true—that Peter was made the veritable foundation and rock. The foundation once laid, and the building upon it, that foundation cannot be changed or removed, but must always continue. For instance, who could think of removing the foundation of St. Peter's, at Rome, without demolishing the structure; but according to the interpretation of Catholicity, when Peter died, the foundation was removed, and his successor at Rome was made the rock or foundation in his stead; so that every time the Pope dies, the Church has to undergo the process of getting a new foundation or changing of the rock. This cannot be gainsayed, for the Pope is not said to be the *representative* of Peter, but his *successor*. Now, a successor to any office, has all the powers, rights and prerogatives of him whom he succeeds. For instance, the present sovereign of England succeeded to all the power and functions of the potentates before her; and so, President Grant succeeded to all the functions given by the Constitution to the first President, of whom he is the last successor; so that, the Pope being the successor of Peter, must now be the veritable rock or foundation on which Christ has built His Church; and as it sometimes occurred that a considerable time elapsed before a new Pope was elected, the Church had to stand during that time without a foundation, for the body of the deceased Pope was, of course, taken from under it as soon as he was dead. The Lord added, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven;" so that Peter, after he had left the earth, had no authority to bind or loose, as it was only while he was on earth that he had authority from this promise—although, all that he spoke

or wrote, as moved by the Spirit of God, has the same binding and loosing power that it had when it was first uttered; but we have had no word or message from him since his death; and he never said anything before he died about having a successor, either in his recorded sayings or his epistles. And he never said anything to lead any one to suppose that he considered *himself* to be the Rock on which the Church was built.

John tells us, in his history, (chap. i. 42,) at the first interview Jesus had with Peter, that He said, "Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, a [rock. O, no! Jesus did not say rock, but] stone." This was to be Simon's new name. In the memorable conversation at Cæsarea Philippi, Peter said to Jesus, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" and then Jesus confirmed what he had said before, by saying, "Thou art Peter, (which is the same as Cephas, by interpretation, *stone*), on this Rock I will build my Church; I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," &c.

Now, in reference to the Kingdom, it had not then come, for Jesus had instructed his apostles, and also the seventy disciples, to go throughout the land of Israel, and to preach that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand. This plainly shows that it had not then come, but was soon to arrive or appear. "On this rock I *will* build my Church." Now, it is quite plain that the Church was not *then* built, but was *to be* in the *future*. "I will give you the Keys." Now, this implies that Peter never had the Keys, but was to receive them at some future time. It was also plain, that the Kingdom announced and prayed for, was to come to, and be set up in this world where the proclamation was made and where the prayers were offered; where it could be *seen, entered into and enjoyed*, and not to come to, or be set up in any other part of God's universe.

Now, it will be observed, that although the Church had not been built, the *foundation* had been laid. Christ said, "On *this* rock." This cannot refer to the future or the past, so that the rock—the foundation—was there present, as certainly as that John was present when Peter said, (John xxi.) "And what shall *this* man do?" Now, both the *Foundation* and the *Builder* were present. *I will build my Church on this rock*—this foundation: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "Flesh and blood did not reveal this unto thee, but my Father, who is in Heaven." "And on *this* rock I will build my Church." This wondrous truth (which the High Priest and elders called Blasphemy—which the Father was first to make known) Peter had the high honour of being the first *man* clearly and fully to enunciate.

This was the foundation laid by Peter, (Acts ii. 36,) on the day of Pentecost, after the descent of the Holy Spirit, when he said, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ;" and on that day, three thousand souls were built upon that rock. They that gladly received his word, (this great truth,) were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them three thousand souls. According to the interpretations of Catholicity, Peter ought to have added, "And let all the house of Israel also know, that you cannot be saved, unless you believe also *on* and are built *upon me*; for I am the foundation or the rock, on which all who are saved by Christ must be

built." Whet joy there would be throughout Papaldom, if they could find in the Scriptures such a passage as this. None of the apostles preached themselves—they always preached Christ. Thus, when Peter went by the command of the Holy Spirit, (Acts x.) with the Keys of the Kingdom to open the door of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Gentiles, he told them that God preached "peace by Jesus Christ;" that God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost; that though the Jews slew and hanged Him on a tree, yet God raised Him up the third day; that it is He who is ordained of God to be the Judge of the living and the dead; and that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins. And, at the close of these words, the Holy Spirit fell upon the Gentiles present; and they entered into the Church, as "God had granted them repentance unto life;" and they had all remission of sins, without hearing the first word about Peter being the rock on which they were all built, if the interpretation of Catholicity be true!

When Philip the Evangelist, by command of the Spirit (Acts ix. 29), joined himself to the chariot of the Treasurer of Ethiopia, who was reading the 53rd of Isaiah, Philip began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus; and all that Philip required of him, in order to his baptism, was that he should believe in his heart that Jesus Christ was the Son of God. And so with Paul, at Corinth, (Acts xviii. 8,) "Paul was pressed in spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ: and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized. And in writing to that same Church, he says: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ;" and he says (Cor. i. 30, 31,) "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption. That according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." And again, (chap. xv. 3,) "For I delivered unto you that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures;" and in the 2nd verse, "By this ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain." Nothing about Peter being the rock in all this—no glorying in him. The glorying was only in the Lord.

The Church of Rome, as she freely admits, claims the right and power to *curse* all who refuse to believe any of her dogmas. Now, I would draw her attention to two classes of persons who are cursed by the Apostle Paul, (Gal. i. 8,) "But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed;" and he repeats, "If any man preach any other Gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed." The other is (1 Cor. xvi. 22,) "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha."

Rome curses those who *do* preach the same Gospel that Paul preached; and Rome curses those who *do love* the Lord Jesus Christ—because they do not also preach faith in all the dogmas of the Church, and because they do not love the Pope. John says, "This is the love of God, that ye keep His commandments;" and this must therefore be the love of the Pope, that ye keep his commandments.

I would say to the Clergy of that Church, does not the curse of God, through Paul, rest heavily and terribly upon you, for preaching

another Gospel than what he preached? Which of your missionaries preach Christ as "the only name given under heaven by which we must be saved;" and that "There is one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus?" Do you not all preach for salvation, that all must believe in the Pope and the dogmas of the Church; that Mary is Queen of Heaven, &c.? which Paul never heard of, and which none of the apostles or evangelists ever knew; and it is evident that the Lord approved and confirmed what *they* preached, by "bearing them witness with signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost."

One word in reference to the term *Petrus*, [stone] applied to Simon Peter, and *Petra*, [rock] the foundation on which the Church was to be built. They are not identical. A stone, of course, may be either small or large—a pebble or a boulder; although always hard, it can be moved. The term Rock gives the idea of immovable solidity; as defined by Worcester—a stone of immense size. Both stone and rock, *Petrus* and *Petra* are used figuratively here; but two things so distinct as *stone* and *rock*, cannot each represent the same thing, without explanation from him who uses them, showing that he means them to be so understood. If the Lord had said "Thou art Peter, [stone] and on this *stone* I will build my Church, the interpretation of Catholicity might have something like the appearance of a *stone* to stand upon, while assuming that the identical words had an identity of meaning; but our Lord would not speak of building even a house upon a *stone*, [see the close of His sermon on the mount,] much less of building the glorious fabric of His Church—the temple of the living God! the Kingdom of Heaven! upon a *stone*! but upon a *Rock*—upon the same Rock that followed the Israelites in the wilderness, and Paul says that Rock was Christ; and therefore it is forcing an interpretation upon that passage, which (in making Peter the rock) none but the adherents of the Pope ever received, and which is in opposition to so many plain passages of Scripture; and to set up a claim, as the Pope does upon this interpretation, to be the foundation on which the Church or Kingdom of Heaven is built—is, to say the least of it, as daring an assumption as that of Satan, when he said, All the kingdoms of the world are mine—Luke iv. 6.

Father Ferguson quotes, as do all Romanists, with great emphasis, what Jesus said to Peter, (John xxi.) "Feed my lambs;" "feed my sheep." How did he feed them? If we had had no record of what he did, we might be in doubt about it. Judging from the style of the Pope, we would suppose him to have said in his Epistle, "The Bishops that are among you, I command—as the Vicar of Christ, the Prince of the Apostles, and your Lord the Pope—that you must submit yourselves in all things unto me, and unto my successors in the Holy See at Rome; and feed the flock of God, that is among you, over which I have made you overseers." This is in accordance with the interpretation of Catholicity. But how does it accord with Peter, himself? Let us hear him: (1 Peter, i. 5,) "The elders among you, I exhort, who am also an Elder;" [mark the modest title he assumes!] "Feed the flock of God, that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock." The flock, of course, includes all, both sheep and lambs, whom Peter was

enjoined by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, to feed; and he says, addressing these lambs and sheep, "As new-born babes, *desire the sincere milk of the Word*, that ye may grow thereby."

The pure milk of the Word of God is, therefore, the only food that Peter prescribes to strengthen and mature the flock; and this accords with what the Saviour said, during His memorable temptation, (Matt. iv. 4,) "Man shall not live by bread alone, [which only supports the natural life] but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Nothing is said by either Peter or Christ, about this Word being unfit to nourish the sheep and lambs until it had passed through the crucible of Papal interpretation. How long would Popery exist, if the Popes, Bishops and Priests would give the flock nothing but the pure Word of God?

Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says, "If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am unto you, for the seal of my apostleship are ye in the Lord." So that, if Peter be not authority to other churches, he certainly should be to the Church of Rome; as she claims to be the seat of his supremacy, and from whom she derives her authority; and on which foundation she is built: and therefore, she should especially follow the instructions of Peter given to the flock—the sheep and lambs of the fold. But it may be said, without fear of successful contradiction, that no Church in existence pays so little regard to the commands of Peter, as given in his words and ratified by his example, as this same Church of Rome.

It may be well here to ask, Is it not passing strange, that Peter never mentioned the Church at Rome in any of his sermons or Epistles? and addressed both his letters to "the strangers scattered abroad throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia," and "to those who have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God and the Lord Jesus Christ."—1 Peter i. and 2 Peter, i. Thus both epistles were addressed to all the believers, and he says to them all, (2nd Epistle, chap. i.) "Add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity." "If ye do these things, ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Does Catholicity admit that these things are sufficient to ensure an entrance into Heaven? No; its whole history and all her dogmas answer, "No!"

The Church of Rome calls herself the Mother Church, (Holy Mother) and the oldest Church; and she claims that without her endorsement, God could not be believed; that His word could not be received as a rule of faith. She has affixed that endorsement, but adds the proviso: It is only the rule of faith as interpreted by Catholicity. While talking once in a friendly way, with one of the Owen Sound Priests, he said: "How can you Protestants know that the Bible is the Word of God?" I answered, "It bears upon it the broad and deep impress of Inspiration; and besides this, the fulfilment of prophecy demonstrates its truth." And I instanced especially, the fulfilment of the prophecy of Daniel in reference to the four kingdoms, as delivered in stating and expounding the dream of Nebuchadnezzar about the wondrous image, whose brightness was so excellent, and whose form was so terrible. The Priest replied, "But

still, you cannot know that the Bible is true, without the authority of our Church." "Well, said I, "if this be so, we have all the authority of the Church of Rome as well as you." This evidently gave the Priest a new idea, and after a moment's silence, he admitted that we had.

This, of course, cannot be disputed. We all admit that the Church of Rome was a Church of Christ until it apostatized from the truth; and as before this, she had received the Bible as true, we have, of course, her evidence, if we required it, to establish its truth. And what then becomes of the assertion so persistently made by Romanists, that Protestants cannot make an act of faith, because they do not believe in the dogmas of Catholicity?

As to the claim that the Church of Rome was the first Church, The Acts of the Apostles, which she has endorsed as authentic, tells us that the Church in Jerusalem was the first Church; and that there were Churches in Judea, Samaria, Cesærea, Antioch, and many other places, before there was an account of there being any in Rome. To show that the Apostle Paul did not recognise the Church of Rome as having a right to dictate to the other Churches, he says to the Church of the Thessalonians, first epistle ii. 14, "Ye became followers of the Churches of God which in *Judea* are in Christ Jesus."—Not followers of the Church of Rome.

It is claimed by the Papal Rabbies, that because the Church at Rome was once a true Church of Christ, therefore it must always be so. To show that this does not necessarily follow, we have only to instance the Church of Laodæcea, Rev. iii., one of the seven Churches of Asia—the only Churches to whom the Lord Jesus ever sent an epistle. In His letter to this Church, the last addressed, He says: "Because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will vomit you out of my mouth." It had become to Him an object of loathing and nausea. But He tells them what was their own opinion of themselves: "Thou sayest I am rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing." To this affirmative the Lord answers, No! and this No outweighs the *Yes of the universe!* "Thou knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Laodæcea was then a city of great wealth; and in this respect the Church may have had abundance, but she was destitute of the true riches—she had no treasure in heaven.

Mr. Ferguson likens me to birds that feed upon carrion, and says "he chooses to fix his attention, not on the sanctity of the body of Christ, which is His Church [that is the Church of Rome,] but on the errors of individuals, here and there within her." I would ask any one who reads this correspondence, if this be true. Have I not from the first, been exposing and condemning the doctrines and practices of the *Church of Rome as a whole?* Where or when did I select *individuals* as subjects of animadversion as distinct from the general system?

Mr. Ferguson likens me also, as mentioned before, to a swine rising from the gutter, and rubbing myself against and besmearing the beautiful buttresses of his grand old Church. Did Mr. Ferguson ever hear of the harlot who had become rich by her *profession*, but whose beauty had gone, and was able by paste and paint to hide the ravages made by vice and dissipation; but a person who was one of the objects of her blandishments, suspecting the deception, rubbed his white handkerchief rather roughly over her face, which, removing the mask,

made bare the loathsome blotches that had been concealed; but she, in a furious rage, *cursed* him for having daubed her face with his handkerchief, while it was only the handkerchief that had been dirtied by contact with her face. And again, of the man who tried to pass himself through quarantine, by covering up, and thus trying to hide a bad and infectious disease, hoping to escape detection; but when the examining surgeon took off the covering, and inserted a lancet into a suspicious protuberance, a discharge of fetid corruption was the result; but the patient, in a passion, swore that it was the surgeon's lancet that had besmeared him, for he himself was both hale and sound. And thus, when Jesus tore off the mask from the Scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem, these whited sepulchres, in the madness of their rage, accused him of being in league with Beelzebub, and also a blasphemer, and hated him "because he testified that their deeds were evil." But this did not prevent him from driving the sword of the spirit, the word of God, up to the very hilt into their system of hypocrisy and traditions, established not by the interpretations of Catholicity, of course, but by the interpretations of Judaism; and he thus made bare "their putrifying sores."

One would naturally suppose, that the Church of Rome would have paid special attention to Paul's epistle written to that Church. At that time we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, the Jewish Pontiffs, as Mr. Ferguson delights to call them, were in full authority, and claimed with the Priests and Levites and their adherents to be the true church of God; but notwithstanding this assumption, in accordance with the saying of Jesus (Matt. xxi. 43) the Kingdom of God was to be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. The Apostle Paul tells the Roman Christians that the unbelieving Jews, the natural branches of the olive tree, had been broken off, and that contrary to nature, they, the believing Gentiles, to whom he wrote, had been grafted in, and "partook of the root and fatness of the olive tree;" and he says to them in solemn warning "Be not highminded but fear. For if God spared not the natural branches take heed that he spare not thee."

In despite of this prophetic warning; has not the Church of Rome been highminded? has she not assumed the right to lord it over the whole world, and to crush and destroy all who disputed that right? and although she still exists now as a huge Ecclesiastical Corporation, called the Church of Rome, as did in the time of the apostle, the nominal Jewish Church at Jerusalem, which "had made void the law of God through their traditions," and had been cut off, so has the Roman Church been cut off in consequence of doing as they did in raising the authority of Popes and Councils above the authority of God, as I have clearly shown, and hundreds of Christian writers before me.

Paul addressed his Epistle "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called saints." How many are there in Rome now, to whom this would apply? It was admitted by Archbishop Purcell in his celebrated debate with Alexander Campbell, (before referred to) that there had been but one saint among the last fifty Popes, and if there was only one among fifty of the Vicars of Christ, the sovereign Pontiffs and the successor of St. Peter, and the Holy Fathers, what proportion may we presume would be found among the Cardinals, Bishops and Priests, not mentioning the laity? Now, as none were recognized by the apostle Paul as belonging to the Church at Rome, but those

who were beloved of God and called saints, the Church of Rome can not be what it once was, for it now embraces all grades of character, from the reputably pious and moral down to the lowest grade of vice and profligacy, providing they continue to profess to adhere to the dogmas of the Church. Whoever heard of even a murderer being excommunicated from the Church, if he still professed to be a Catholic and was willing to listen to the Priest; and on the other side, no matter how holy and blameless a man may be, though he loves God and keeps his commandments, if he will not submit to the authority of the Church, she hurls against him excommunication and damnation.

I have referred before to the worshipping of saints, and especially of Mary, for while Peter is the foundation, Mary is the keystone of the Papal arch; and the system might properly be called *Maryanity* instead of Christianity, as there is far more honor given to Mary than to Christ. Now, in order to show how little warrant this has in the Scriptures, which the Romish Church professes to believe, I shall examine all the passages, where Mary's name is mentioned after the birth of her first-born son (first-born always implies that there are others born after). Luke ii., we are told, the shepherds came with haste to Bethlehem, after they had seen the vision of angels; and they found Joseph and Mary, and the babe lying in a manger, and they told what things were told them concerning this child. But Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart. And when His parents brought Him to Jerusalem to present Him to the Lord, Simeon, an old prophet, took Him in His arms, and blessed Him, and said unto Mary His mother, "This child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign that shall be spoken against. Yea, a sword shall pierce through thine own soul, also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed;" and 41st verse, we are told that His parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover. And when Jesus was twelve years old, they went as at other times, "And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the Child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem, and Joseph and His mother knew not of it. After three days they found Him, and His mother said unto him, Why hast Thou thus dealt with us? behold Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing; and He replied, How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them; but His mother kept all these sayings in her heart."

Matt. xii. 47: "Then said one unto Him, Behold Thy mother and Thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with Thee." He answered, "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And He stretched forth His hand towards His disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whoever shall do the will of my Father who is in Heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." See also Mark iii. 31, 38; Matt. xiii. 55: "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary? and His brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and His sisters, are they not all with us?" It is evident from this, and from Mark vi. 3, that Mary had four sons besides Jesus, and daughters—it is not said how many. But the dogmas of Catholicism deny this, and look upon it as horrid impiety to believe in what is stated in these passages to be true. Luke viii. 21: "My mother and my brethren are those who hear the word of God, and keep it."

Luke xi. 27: "A certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare Thee, and the paps which Thou has sucked. But He said, Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." In this passage, we have *incipient Maryolity* rebuked. The Lord foresaw what would be the interpretation of Catholicity in reference to this matter, and that the creature would be honored above the Creator; and these sayings of His were doubtless recorded to leave those who did it without excuse. To show the force of the passage as above, "*rather blessed*," &c., we may refer to Luke xviii. 14, where the Pharisee and Publican are introduced—the one a self-righteous professor, the other a humble publican; and Jesus decided their comparative characters by saying, "This man (the publican) went down to his house, justified *rather* than the other." And it is evident, that Mary never had the remotest thought of assuming any authority in the Kingdom of Heaven; and it would be well for Catholics to duly consider her injunction to the servants at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, "Whatever He saith unto you, do it." This is the only command of hers on record; and this is just in accordance with the command of the Father, on the Mount of Transfiguration, and the only command given by Him in an audible tone to man, relating to Jesus, (Matt. xvii.) "This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him." The command of His mother had reference to a particular circumstance, and was given to certain individuals; while the command of His Father is of universal obligation, embracing all nations and generations of men.

The last words spoken by Jesus in reference to His mother, (John xix. 26, 27,) were while He was suffering the agony of crucifixion, and when the saying of the good old Simeon was fulfilled, (Luke ii. 35,) "A sword shall pierce through thine own soul, also." Who can conceive the intense agony of that mother during those fearful three hours, while "that holy thing born of her, and called the Son of God," hung upon the cross; second only to the agony of that Son, whose "*soul was made* [as well as his body] an offering for sin." It was then that Jesus, "seeing His mother, and the disciple standing by whom He loved, He said unto His mother: Woman, behold thy son! Then said He to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home."

What a glorious mark of confidence in John, to select him as the future protector of His mother! Doubtless, that mother saw her Son after His resurrection; but we have no record of their meeting, and the last time that Mary is mentioned in the Scriptures, is Acts i. 14: "These all continued [that is, the apostles] with one accord, in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brethren." Now, I would ask, Is there any thing in any or in all these passages combined, that give the least countenance to the interpretations of Catholicity in reference to Mary, as authorizing the Pope to crown and proclaim her Queen of Heaven, and the universal mediator between mankind and her Son Jesus. Paul says (1 Tim. ii. 8,) "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus: Who gave Himself a ransom for all;" and can the force of absurdity further go, than to say that a *mediator* is required between man and his *Mediator*? Mary said of herself, (Luke i. 48,) "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed;" and the angel said, (28th verse) "Hail! thou

that art highly favored; the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women." And both of these sayings, like all the utterances of the Spirit of God, are eternally true. But so far as relates to the glory and blessedness of Heaven, hers does not exceed that of "those who hear the Word of God, and keep it."

Now let us consider some of the things that are said in the Law and in the Prophets, and the Psalms, and in the New Testament, concerning Jesus, by which we shall see the position which He occupies in the Church and the Universe. Gen. xviii. 22: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Deut. xviii.: "A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you like unto me, (Moses) Him shall ye hear." Psalms cii. 25, quoted by Paul in Hebrews i.: "Of old Thou hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the Heavens are the works of Thine hands; and again, Let all the angels of God worship Him." Isaiah vii. 14: "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel, which is, God with us." Isaiah ix. 6: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given and the Government shall be on his shoulders, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his Government and Power there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever." Isa. liii.: "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities."

These passages may suffice from the Old Testament, and we shall see how they are sustained and illustrated in the New: John i.: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory—the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Matt. iii. 16, 17: "And Jesus, when He was baptized, went straightway up out of the water, and lo! the Heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him. And lo! a voice from Heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." It may be here observed, that this is the first time that the whole Godhead was made known to man. The Father audibly, and the Son and the Holy Spirit visibly present. In the xvii chapter, on the Mount of Transfiguration, in presence of Moses and Elijah, these words were repeated by the Father, with the addition, "Hear ye Him." Matt. xxv. 21: "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory: and before Him shall be gathered all nations." Matt. xxviii. 18: "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth." Heb. i.: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son; whom He hath appointed heir of all things; by whom, also He made the worlds: Who, being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, after he had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Col. i. 14: "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our sins: Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature." 1 Pet. ii. 24—Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree."

John i. 29, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Rev. i. 8, "I am the beginning and ending,—the Almighty." Now, I would ask, in the face of these passages, will any priest dare to say, that Mary and Jesus occupy the same position relatively in the Church of Rome that they do in the Scriptures?

Nothing is said of Mary, that places her in any other position than that of a highly-favored woman, without any investment of authority in the Church on earth or in heaven, or of having any influence or control over the salvation of any human being. But Christ is made known as the Creator, the Redeemer, Saviour and Judge of his people, and as the only name given under heaven, among men whereby we can be saved; and every individual is personally accountable to Him, for we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. And because this is so, every individual is addressed, "Preach the Gospel to every creature, He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved, And to each individual in each of the seven Churches of Asia" (Rev. ii. 3), Jesus says, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches." As interpreted by Catholicity, He ought to have added, that "all shall be damned who have not ears to hear what the Pope says unto the Churches; for to him as my Vicar, is the ultimate appeal in all matters of right and wrong."

Mr. Ferguson, at the close of his letter, sneers at what he calls my little pop-gun, which he says, seems to be the only weapon in my armoury. I shall leave an intelligent public to decide as to the comparative power and efficiency of the weapons, employed by him and me in the present controversy. He also says in his letter "I am now done with you, and intend to take no more notice of anything you may address to me." Notwithstanding this resolution, he has nevertheless forgotten, or changed it so far, as to pour forth editorially in the *Canadian Freeman*—bless the mark! of the 6th and 14th April, several columns of abuse of me and Protestantism generally, which we give below, in order that the public, other than Catholics, may have an opportunity of admiring his flourish of trumpets, under cover of which he comes up to "kick against the goads." His first article is under the caption "Tristram Shandy again," and is as follows:

"TRISTRAM SHANDY" AGAIN.

(From the "*Canadian Freeman*," [Catholic Paper] April 6th, 1871.)

Some weeks ago, Father Ferguson, of this city, delivered a Lecture in the Town Hall, Owen Sound,—the subject being "Infallibility." As many of the audience were Protestants, the Rev. gentleman, avoiding controversy, confined himself to a simple statement of the Catholic theory, and the scriptural and other grounds upon which that theory is based. At the close of the address, he very naturally adverted to the present afflicted condition of the Holy Father, and protested energetically against the injustice perpetrated upon him. Of course, such a Lecture was little likely to pass unchallenged, and as might be expected, a writer—who is by religious profession what they call a Disciple or Campbellite—made a very curious reply to it in the *Owen Sound Times*. The reasoning of the gentleman we may, perhaps, notice hereafter. For the present, we draw attention to a grave and shameful crime committed by him towards the end of his communication.

In opposition to the character for goodness claimed for the present Sovereign Pontiff, this northern advocate of Protestantism says:—"In order to show you the character of Pope Pius, whom Mr. Ferguson called 'that kind and genial old man, whom everybody loves,' I shall ask you, Mr. Editor, to copy the following paternal address to Victor Emmanuel." And then he publishes—what do our readers think? The real letters of excommunication issued against that unfortunate monarch? Not at all! Truth never yet sufficed for the needs of such controversy; but a tirade of mingled obscenity and blasphemy, concocted by a profligate Protestant minister named Sterne, and published more than one hundred years ago in a novel now called "Tristram Shandy."

Hereupon, Father Ferguson wrote to the paper, giving the history of the vile production, and the date and page of the book in which it was to be found, and concluded a very civil letter by charitably expressing his opinion that only a mistake had been made, and the gentleman's scholarship—not his honesty—was at fault. This, one would have thought, was sufficient; especially as the same shameful forgery had been contradicted, and its publication handsomely apologized for in the Hamilton papers of a week or two before. But what think our readers did this advocate of truth-loving Protestantism do in the circumstances we have described? Avow his mistake, and beg pardon for it? By no manner of means. In reply, he says in substance, that though he took up "Tristram Shandy" about forty years ago, yet he found it a stupid book; did not read it, and really does not know whether the curse, as he calls it, is there! What amiable, child-like innocence! But when he was shown that through its means, he had been led to make a grossly unjust charge against the Head of the Catholic Church, is it unreasonable to say it was his plain duty, in spite of the insult to a fastidious taste, to take up the book again, and examine at least that passage, and then own like a man, that he had made a mistake, and was sorry for it? Common decency required this much.

But this is not the worst feature in this foul proceeding. He wrote the letter with a full knowledge, according to his own declaration, that the "curse" had already been ascribed to Sterne; for he tells us, in his defence, that he has read with great care the controversy between Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, and Alexander Campbell, and that in that discussion the prelate had shown the real paternity of the wicked forgery. So that he is branded by his own confession, with the guilt of having ascribed to a living Pope writing to a living King, a production which thirty years ago was shown to be the work of a half-infidel Protestant minister. Verily, holy Protestantism is hard up when it needs such defence, and glories in such defenders!

The explanation which follows this statement in his letter is too good to be unnoticed. He is not acquainted with such works as Tristram Shandy. He thinks it enough to read the Bible! All truth is there, and there is no need to go beyond it! This—let our readers not laugh—is actually the kind of reason he assigns for not knowing the real authorship of the iniquitous lie, though a moment before he admitted he did know it. May we not exclaim: "O Sacred Book, what villanies are perpetrated in thy name, what lies told!" We ask this writer, [was it in the Bible] you found this ruffianly insult to

decency and religion which you ascribed to the Pope? Of a certainty it is not there; therefore you do read other books, and your defence is a piece of most hypocritical cant, calculated to bring contempt upon both the Bible and all religious profession. Does it not recall the *virtuousness* of Gloster in Richard III.,

"But then I sigh, and with a piece of scripture,
Tell them"—a great lie upon the Pope.*

But we are not yet done. He has seen the same curse in the *Cincinnati Christian (?) Review*, in the *Hamilton Spectator*, and has heard that the *London Times* published it with an editorial of "scathing sarcasm." Not a doubt of it. But is not a lie a lie still, though twenty or twenty thousand times told? And does not each telling of it by those conscious of its nature, instead of transmuting it into truth, only aggravate indefinitely the guilt of those who circulate it? No doubt this writer has seen it in the places he describes. We ourselves have seen it in the *Owen Sound Times*, in the original home in Tristram Shandy, and we know not in how many places beside; and we expect to see it again, if we live, in as many more: for we know that controversialists—of the disreputable character we are now dealing with—cannot afford to let it die. It is a Godsend—or, far more correctly, a Devilsend,—for such as are anxious for the fame of seeing their name in print, who are malicious enough to wish it true, too illiterate to know whether it is or not, and so blindly opposed to the Catholic Church, that no evidence can change their opinions, even on facts like this, which they can see with their eyes.

We now come to the last and most iniquitous feature of this controversy. He asks us to produce a real act of excommunication, and show wherein it differs from the forgery; and says Mr. Campbell, in dispute with the Bishop, got over the difficulty, by affirming that he had many others of a like kind. (If he had, would he not have been glad to produce them? The greatest cheat on the street would rather have a good bill than a bad one only the latter is so much cheaper,)—and that at all events, it is only an echo of the many anathemas pronounced by the Council of Trent. Now, let us reflect a moment upon this request, and its relation to the whole matter in hand. May we not state the case thus:—

Protestant Controversialist—"I admit I cannot make good my charge against Pius IX., for I am sorry to see it was not he at all, but a profligate minister of one of our own sects, that perpetrated the enormity. I admit I am rather in a tight place, but then I am a great fellow, and you—you are only a Papist, and used to this kind of thing. Could you not help me out of the difficulty? You are not guilty of what I have charged upon you; but couldn't you confess to something equally bad. You are not the blasphemers I said; but may be you are murderers, or adulterers, or (in no very loud voice) forgers. Any decent crime, that is enormous enough to suit the Protestant taste for scandal, will do. Own up like a man, and get me out of this fix."

This is not satire, but a plain statement in familiar language of the

*Will the reader please turn to my first letter in reply to Mr. Ferguson, and see there what I said about the Bible as compared with other books; and he will be able to appreciate the foul misrepresentation and abuse contained in the above passage.

defence this writer makes for publishing as a letter of the Pope's, a Protestant minister's forgery. And we can do nothing for him. The annals of eighteen centuries of Catholicity furnish nothing to match it. It stands alone, of special baseness, obscene and blasphemous, a lie, without a shred of truth or verisimilitude either in it, or intended to be in it; a coarse joke of a clever bad man, which neither the piety of the *Christian (?) Review* nor the respectability of the *Hamilton Spectator*,* nor the scholarship of the *London Times*, can change from its original character of being a pure fabrication, or in Dr. Johnson's plain speech, a lie, sir, a lie, and there's an end on't.

Having now given the history of this precious document, and the defence set up for it, we ask our Owen Sound contemporary, who allowed it to appear in his columns, what he is going to do about it? The issuer of a forged paper, knowing it to be forged, is as guilty as the original forger,—and no respectable journalist can too soon purge himself of all appearance of complicity in so nefarious a proceeding. Here we leave it.

In Mr. Ferguson's first Letter in reference to the above curse, to the *Owen Sound Times*, he begins: "Will you allow me a small space in your columns, that I may correct a very ridiculous blunder your last week's correspondent about Infallibility fell into;" but in his editorial above, writing for Catholics only, he calls it "a grave and shameful crime." Now, if it were a grave and shameful crime, it was surely a *ridiculous blunder* in Mr. F. to describe it as he did at first; and if it were only a ridiculous blunder, as he described it *then*, it is surely a grave and shameful crime, for the purpose of traducing an opponent, to describe it as he does *now*. Which horn of the dilemma will you take, Mr. Ferguson?

I would here ask: Why does Mr. Ferguson lower himself so much as to hurl the thunder of his heavy artillery "against my poor pop-gun?" why does he not attack the thunderer of the *London Times*, and call upon him to tell the world that he was sorry for the grave and shameful crime of publishing the invention of Sterne as the veritable curse of Pope Pius against the King of Italy? In doing this, he would have a foeman worthy of his steel. But Mr. Ferguson's modesty is probably too great for this, as was shown by his allowing himself to be rolled up and put into the handkerchief of that Ecclesiastical Giant, that the reader will remember about.

The *Freeman* says that I said Mr. Campbell, in his debate with Archbishop Purcell, got over the difficulty by affirming that he had many others of a like kind as the curse he read. The reader may remember that I said, in my reply to Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Campbell said: "I quote this from one of the newspapers of the day. I have several such cases in the books around me; but they are some *two or three centuries old*, and in foreign countries, and therefore I select this modern one." Mr. Campbell had no difficulty to get over here. He simply stated a fact, which the Archbishop did not dare to dispute, that he had several curses of the same kind in books, some two or three hundred years old.

*The *Hamilton Spectator* handsomely apologized in his next issue, to Father Heenan, for this publication, and thanked the Very Rev. gentleman for pointing out the mistake; and the Owen Sound writer could hardly help knowing this.

Mr. Ferguson says, that the last and most iniquitous feature of this controversy, is my asking him to produce a real act of excommunication. Can the reader imagine a more absurd charge than this? What a daring and unpardonable crime it was for me, to ask for an authentic copy of a public document issued and published by the Pope, against a King whom he had excommunicated!

In connection with the "handsome apology" made by the *Hamilton Spectator*, the editor stated that Father Heenan had promised to give him a *genuine copy of the real curse*, and which the editor promised to publish. Whether the editor had misunderstood the Priest, or whether the Priest had made a promise unadvisedly, which he *dared* not keep, is a matter which I shall not pretend to decide; but the copy, I understand, was not given, and therefore not published. But who but *Father Ferguson* ever dreamed of it being a heinous offence for the editor to ask for it? Now, all the "*Tristram Shandy*" dust, that Mr. Ferguson has raised, will not prevent the public from believing that the real curse, if not the one published in the *Times*, is at least so like it, that he dare not publish it; and what he says about my wishing him to help me out of the difficulty, is (to use a word that I often heard when a child) nothing but *balderdash*; and I now repeat the "heinous offence," in saying again, Give us the *true curse*, and set the matter at rest.

The next article in reference to this controversy is entitled "The Primacy."

THE PRIMACY.

(From the "*Canadian Freeman*," [Catholic Paper] April 13th, 1871.)

Last week we gave a specimen of the modes adopted by a certain class of Protestant writers, to prejudice the public mind against the Head of the Church. The *True Witness* would call it the mode of the "lie direct." These writers stir up the reeking cesspools into which a half-infidel Protestant minister discharged the foul and blasphemous imaginings of a mind that very likely hated Christianity cordially, and then would have the world believe that the noisome stenches are the atmosphere of the Church. The Devil, in Heaven, once wished to be God, or like to Him; and now on the earth, unable to put off the marks and tokens of ruin that cling round him, he would fain put himself in the place of the Almighty Goodness, and cast upon It the contempt and hatred that cannot but be felt for his fallen and degraded estate. So heresy, when it has given birth to monsters of which it is ashamed, would like to fix their paternity on the Church. We have exposed one such attempt, and now go on to a duty of a like kind.

Papal Infallibility is the necessary corollary of the Primacy. Admit the latter, and the former follows as naturally as the shadow follows the body which throws it. This we will show in our next issue. For the present, let us consider an argument from our northern light, directed against that Primacy in these words: "We go to the New Testament, and we find there a deed of gift recorded to Peter, of the Keys of the Kingdom; but we do not find any record there of their transfer to the Pope of Rome, or anybody else, and therefore we cannot admit his title."

This is the fallacy we wish to expose, not because it is advanced by this obscure objector, but because it is a common means by which even earnest Protestants deceive themselves. Let us illustrate its logical value by a precisely similar reasoning:—"We go to the New Testament, and find there evidence of the existence of Peter, but we find no record of his death; therefore, we cannot admit that he is dead, and we are right in speaking of the authority of Peter as one still alive." How will this conclusion be accepted? Very much, we fear, after the manner of a conclusion by one of the scientific tailors of Lapata—that is, it would be rightly laughed at.

Or, let us take a more striking illustration. We go again to the New Testament, and we find there no mention of either Protestants or Protestantism, or any of its various divisions; therefore we cannot admit that there is such a thing upon the earth at all. If, now, relying upon this conclusion, we sally out into the streets, and in joy of such a singular discovery, clap our hands and exclaim that there is not, and never was, and never will be, such an absurdity as Protestantism, we fancy we would be stopped as a madman by the first person that deigned to notice our ravings. "Open your eyes, look round and see," would be the natural, spontaneous remark of any one of sense at sight of such an illusion. But in this case we would be only following out with a rigid logic the teachings of that principle, which is appealed to as unanswerable, as simply crushing our attempts at answer, namely, that what is not found in the New Testament must not be admitted.* But we suppose our objector will meet the case by the explanation that though the word Protestant is not found in the Holy Book, the principles upon which it rests are there so plainly evident, that there is no one but may see them. This is the only way out of the difficulty he has imprudently created for himself, and our having forced him to follow that way is just all we wanted. For thereby he admits that the Holy Scriptures teach principles, the right or wrong understanding of, and acting upon, which, give rise to true or false systems of religion. He is then obliged to yield the vantage ground he ignorantly thought he had gained over us, and is forced to get off his grand stilts and walk like an ordinary mortal, upon the ground. He is bound to contend, and show that *his* intelligence of these principles is the only true and correct one, and that everybody else—and that is about a million to one—has entirely mistaken the meaning of the sacred word. This is rather harder work than he proposed to himself, we fancy.

Having now shown the utter untenableness of the position assumed by this man, we dismiss him for the present, and address ourselves to the not over difficult task of showing the reasons—irresistible to those who honestly and intelligently admit the authority of the Bible—why we hold the Primacy of the Pope, and as a consequence, his Infallibility. Is there anything in the four Gospels more explicitly or carefully set forth than the fact that Christ instituted a Church?—"Upon this rock I will build my Church." Is there any mistaking the meaning of this clear statement? We fancy not. Well, a Church, which is a congregation of many in order to be a Church, not *churches*,

* This rigid logic amounts to this: Some things exist that are not mentioned in the New Testament; Protestantism is one of those things—therefore Popery is true!! How admirable and convincing!

must have a Head. Everything that has life has a head, from the lowliest thing that creeps, up to man—the king of visible creation. There is a central cell, from which all development begins, even in plants and trees. Every organization, from that of a village council up to the great law-making Assembly of the nation, is incomplete, only inchoative until it has a head appointed in its chairman or speaker. Every republic, empire, kingdom—all must have a head, or they are only a mob. And this head, for the very reason that it is a head, must not be two or more, but only one. A five-legged animal would draw a whole city to look at it as a wonder; but a two-headed creature would make a fortune for many Barnums. Why? Because it would be contrary to all our perceptions of the laws of God, as manifested in the mighty creation—from the one sun, whose attraction controls and regulates the movements of all the heavenly bodies, down to the one king, or emperor, or president, or to the one father presiding and ruling in the family, and still further to the head which completes the individual body, and contains in itself the organs of sight, smell, hearing, &c. But why pursue the thought at needless length? Does not common sense, instinct, answer that a headless, or a two-headed body is such a monstrosity, a blot on the creation, a thing at which men would shudder, as indicating the wrath of the Creator.

We have very cogent reasons, then, for thinking, antecedently to any examination into the constitution of the Church, that she, like all the rest of the Divine Founder's works, has one Head. She is the perfection of the visible creation, and must conform to its laws. And what we expect, we find at the very first glance into the Sacred Book: "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." "Feed my lambs;" "feed my sheep." Here is Headship expressed with a clearness and an abundance of enforcement that shames even scepticism into submission. The holder of the keys can keep all out, or let all in; or exercise his discretion. The possessor of the food is supreme—for he can starve his subjects into submission. No prince or potentate ever was possessed of such unquestioned supremacy, as is symbolized by the grant to Peter of the whole food upon which the Church is to subsist. The most despotic monarchs of the East in ancient times, held a power inferior in its kind to this, over their subjects. They never could stop the earth from producing its fruits; nor the forest nor the sea from yielding each its contribution of food; and the people could live in spite of them. But in the life that is to be led in the Church—that supernatural higher life of grace, which Jesus originated, and the Church continues—the very food on which such life is to be sustained, nourished and perfected, was put entirely into Peter's hand, by the absolute, unconditional promise, implied in the order, "Feed my lambs;" "feed my sheep;" and all this by Jesus Christ Himself. And this prerogative of Peter, which we call rightly, the Primacy, as it began with the Church—or, to speak more correctly, as the Church began with it—so also, perseveres to the end, because it belongs to the essence of her constitution; is, indeed, the Rock upon which she was built by Divine hands, to defy and master the power or gates of hell. But the Church, in her essential constitution, remains to the end of time, according to the promise, "I will be with you always, even to the end of the world." The power of the Keys, then, of which the deed of gift to Peter is found recorded

in the New Testament, descends necessarily to his successor; and it is as absurd to say that it does not, because the Testament does not mention the transfer, which could only occur after the great Apostle's death, about which there is not a word in the Bible, as it would be to argue that all the apostles, except James of Jerusalem, are still alive, because the Gospels, and Epistles, and Acts are silent about their deaths. How do we know they are not still alive? By one of two ways—and only two. By tradition, that tells of the fact; or by an admission of the universal law of mortality, to which they, like the rest of men were subject. Now both these informants upon which we so securely and undoubtingly rely, when they attest the demise of the Apostles, also attest the transfer of the power of the Keys. This is not the place to speak of tradition, since our scope confines us to the Scriptures. But if the universality of the law of death is enough to convince us that men who lived eighteen hundred years ago, are not alive now; why should not the universality of the law by which men in office yield up their power to their successor—and in its way the law of transmission of power is as universal as death—be reason enough to convince us that the office to which St. Peter was raised, not for his own sake but for the sake of the world, has descended to his successor? What is a sufficiently reliable informant in one case ought certainly to be, and is logically, a sufficiently reliable informant in the other.

Thus, then, the matter stands. The Holy Scriptures tell us that Peter once lived, but say nothing about his death. We believe and are sure that he is dead, because of our belief in the universal law of mortality. They tell us that he held an office of importance in the Church, that was to endure to the end of time, but say nothing about transmitting that office to a successor. But we believe and are sure he did so transmit it, because the law of such transmission is in its way as universal as the law of death. Here we leave the question for the present in the full assurance, that our opponent will have either to give up his principle, or, what is not very likely, become a firm believer in the Primacy of the Successor of Peter.

The writer quotes from my reply to Mr. Spencer, what I say about the deed of gift in the New Testament of the Keys to Peter; but which says nothing of their transfer to any other person. See the passage in full in above letter. He says: "Let us illustrate its logical value by a precisely similar reasoning. We go to the New Testament, and find evidence there of the existence of Peter, but we find no evidence of his death; therefore, we cannot admit that he is dead, and we are right in speaking of the authority of Peter as one still alive. How will this conclusion be accepted?" And he again repeats that "the Scriptures say nothing about *his death*," and again to make it more sure, he says "there is not a word in the Bible about his death."

Has this Priest ever read what the Lord said to Peter, at the sea of Tiberias? (John xxi, 18,) "When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldst; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thine hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not," and John adds, "This spake He, showing by what death he should glorify God." And has he ever read what Peter himself says?—(2nd Epistle, i. 14, 15,) "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as the

Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me: I will endeavor that ye may be able, after my *decease*, to have these things in remembrance."

I do not think that this Priest gives much evidence of having these things in remembrance: and does it not seem strange, that so intense a *Peterite* as he professes to be, should be so ignorant of what Peter has written, although he is so well posted up in the matter of "*Tristram Shandy*."

If there had been as much said in the Scriptures about Peter's successors, as there is about Peter's death, there could then have been no dispute about his having successors; but even then the Popes could not have established their claim to be those successors unless they had been specially named as such. If Peter had said, I shall endeavor after my decease that the Bishops of the Church of Rome who are to be my successors, may have all these things in remembrance, that they may feed the sheep and the lambs of the Lord Jesus; and to whom are to descend through all ages the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and who shall, as an inalienable privilege of their office, always be preserved "free from doctrinal error," then I would be, as this writer expresses it, "a firm believer in the Primacy of the successor of Peter;" and as in duty bound, listen to the voice of the Pope, as to the voice of God.

This writer observes, "This is not the place to speak of tradition, since our scope confines us to the Scriptures." He has several times, during this controversy, referred to my want of scholarship, because I was not familiar with "*Tristram Shandy*;" but I have clearly shown—first, in the matter of the Jewish High Priests being preserved from doctrinal error; and now, in reference to the death of Peter; that he is very deficient indeed in *Biblical scholarship*; and I would advise him to give up writing about a book of which he evidently knows so little. Judging from my experience, Catholics, both Priests and people, are as a general rule, but very partially acquainted with the Scriptures, excepting those passages which they claim as giving supreme power to Peter and the Pope: "I give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom;" "Upon this rock I will build my Church;" "Feed my sheep," &c.; and these they have constantly upon the nibs of their pens or the end of their tongues, as if they contained the Alpha and Omega of the Word of God.

Mr. Ferguson further says, "We believe and are sure that Peter did transmit his office, because we know that the law of such transmission, in its way, is as sure, as universal as the law of death;" but he does not tell us, that all constitutions of government requiring a head—municipal, republican, and monarchical—always provide for, and regulate the appointment of a successor, when the incumbent dies, or the term of office expires; but where does the Christian constitution provide for a successor to Peter? Where does it say in the Scriptures, even of Peter, that he was the *head* of the body, the Church. This title is given only to Christ, (Col. i. 18, 19.) "And He is the Head of the body, the Church. It pleased the Father, that in Him should all fulness dwell;" (Eph. i. 22) "And hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be *Head* over all things to the Church;" and it is little short of blasphemy to give that glorious title, even to Peter. Christ has no successor in any of His offices, much less as *Head* of the Church. As to how Peter used the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven—in my poem on that subject I think the matter is made

plain, and is in accordance with the views of many thorough Bible students; and I think it will yet be accepted as the only true explanation of the matter. In the gift of the Keys, Peter possessed what was never possessed by any human being, before or since: "I will give *thee* the Keys." It was Peter who opened the door of the Kingdom to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, when he said, "Repent and be baptised for remission of sins," and the same day 3000 of those who asked what they should do, repented and were baptised, and were added to the congregation of believers. And it was Peter who was sent for by express command from God, by his angel, to come to Cæsarea to the house of Cornelius, (Acts x.) to open the door of the Kingdom to the Gentiles; and neither the Jewish nor Gentile door has ever since been shut, and all believing penitents may enter in the same way, and as Paul tells the Colossians (chap. i.) "be translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the Kingdom of God's dear Son."

The Roman Catholic's idea of the Kingdom of Heaven, or the Church, is that of a grand hierarchy, with the Pope as supreme head, and from him spreading out and extending through Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, Vicar-Generals, Abbots, Inquisitors, Priests, Monks, Friars, &c., &c., embracing the Laity, of course, as the *substrata* of the institution. Now, I would observe, that with the exception of Bishops, there was not one of the above functionaries in existence at the time of the apostles, in the Church of Christ; they were all quite unknown to those who established that Church among the nations of the earth, through "the power of the Holy Spirit sent down from Heaven;" and therefore, it follows, as a logical induction, which no priestly arrogance or assumption can set aside, that the Roman Church is not the Church of Christ.

If there had been any of the above functionaries among the brethren to whom Peter wrote, would he not have mentioned them? He addresses them collectively and individually, as each accountable individually to God; and tells them "they had been as sheep going astray, but were now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls." And the Lord Jesus addressed each of the seven Churches of Asia, (Rev. ii. and iii. chap.) as individually responsible to Himself only; and never intimated that there was any other authority outside of each particular congregation, to whom they were to give an account. And when Paul writes to the various Churches of Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Philippi, &c., &c., he never tells any of them that they were amenable to, or under the control of the Church of Rome, or any other ecclesiastical authority, existing as such, in any other Church or congregation.

And again, Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, (chap. iv.) tells them that "Christ, who ascended above all the heavens, that He may fill all things, gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Teachers, for perfecting of the saints; for the work of the ministry; for the building up of the body of Christ." But the interpretation of Catholicity tells us that He gave some Popes, some Cardinals, some Legates, some Archbishops, some Vicars-general, some Abbots, some Inquisitors, and many Monks, Friars, Abbesses, Priests and Nuns, and some Œcumenical Councils, and a great many dead Patron Saints, for building up the body of the Holy Mother at Rome, which they all assume to be the body or Church of Christ. Paul tells us, (which I would especially note) those whom

he mentions were given expressly for the perfecting of the saints, and I would ask, how many saints are there in the Church of Rome? If what Archbishop Purcell says is the case, which I before referred to, that there was only one among the last fifty Popes, where will you find the saints to be *perfected*? Paul also tells us in the same chapter, that there is "one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," to which the interpretation of Catholicity adds, "One Virgin Mary, who is Mother of God and Queen of Heaven, to whom the prayers of all the faithful most constantly ascend." In addition to the title "Roman Church," the people of the Papacy delight to speak of the "Holy Catholic Church" and the "Holy Apostolic Church." We do not read of any such institutions in the Scriptures. These names are no doubt supposed to be more appropriate and more august than the titles that the Holy Spirit has given, viz.: "Church of Christ" and "Church of God;" (Acts xx. 28,) "Feed the Church of God, which He has purchased with His own blood;" (Rom. xvi. 16,) "The Churches of Christ salute you." Are there any adjectives in any of the vocabularies of earth that can equal in dignity and glory the terms "Church of Christ," "Church of God?" No apostle would have dared to degrade it by calling it the *Apostolic Church*; and with what indignant surprise would Peter and Paul and John have put down such an expression.

Mr. Ferguson, "according to the wisdom given to him" by the interpretations of Catholicity, tells us, in the article on the Primacy, that the command, "Feed my sheep," &c., placed in Peter's hands, and through him in the hands of the Popes, all the spiritual food of the Church of Christ; and as the holder of this food, the Pope can starve his subjects into submission. Starve them into submission? yes, crush them with the iron heel of spiritual despotism! This he did in former times, when he had kings to hold his stirrups while he mounted his horse. Pope Pius has tried to do the same with his Italian subjects, who, under the lead of Victor Emmanuel, have thrown off his yoke; and he is now trying to starve Dr. Dollinger, as his predecessor did, to starve Dr. Luther, and it will be no doubt with a similar result,—thus claiming for the Pope the whole spiritual food of the Church, which he can lock up at pleasure. This almost out-Popes the Pope himself, who can scarcely be so intoxicated with the incense of adulation offered him by his subjects, as really to think this. Christ gave the command to Peter, and Peter gave the same command to the Elders of the Churches to whom he wrote; and Paul gave the same command to the Elders of Ephesus, (Acts xx.) And Paul tells the Corinthians (2 Cor. xi.), that upon him came the *care of all the Churches*. Could Peter, if he had been alive at this time, or the Bishop of Rome, have prevented those Churches of which Paul had the care, if they had so willed it, from receiving any spiritual food—that is, prevent them from receiving the sincere milk of the Word, that they might grow thereby. Who can imagine a dogma more terribly dishonoring to Christ, and degrading to His Church, than that which declares that none of the treasures of His grace, in any age, since His ascension, could be received by any of His disciples, except as given and distributed through the hands of the Popes; many of whom, as Archbishop Purcell expresses it, were so wicked that he should not be surprised to find that they are in Hell! Let no Catholic say that this is a Protestant lie, for it is published

over his own signature, and was uttered in the presence of hundreds at Cincinnati.

The Apostle James says, (chap. i. 5,) "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him; but let him ask in faith." But the Apostle forgot to add, "He must ask, believing in the Infallibility of the successors of Peter at Rome; for all the food that is required to sustain the spiritual life of the disciples is put by Christ into their hands, and unless you receive it through them, you must *starve*."

I was in conversation once, with an acquaintance who had turned Roman Catholic, and he said he was convinced, after years of reading and reflection, that the evidence in favor of the Church of Rome being the true Church, far outweighed that of every other; and therefore he became convinced that she was the true Church, and therefore, that all her dogmas were true; and upon this ground he received them all, and he added, "The Infallibility of the Pope was the hardest to receive; but my doubts were silenced by 'It is the doctrine of the true Church, and therefore it must be true, and therefore I must receive it.'"

It was no doubt the reading and reflecting upon the *traditions* and *interpretations of Catholicity*, through which this Protestant became convinced that Rome was the true Church, for, had he spent the same time in reading and meditating upon the Word of God, he could not have come to such a conclusion; but he would have found, (Rev. xvii. 3,) that she is "that woman sitting upon the scarlet beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns;" (6th ver.) "and drunken with the blood of the saints," (illustrated by the murder of the Albigenes, the fires of Smithfield, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, &c., &c.); 9th verse: "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sits." Where is there a city but Rome that has any claim to be called the city of the seven hills? (15th verse,) "The waters which thou sawest, where the Harlot sits, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations and tongues;" (Mr. Ferguson's two hundred and fifty millions!!) 18th verse: "And the woman which thou sawest, is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." There was no city existing at the time that John wrote, but Rome (then Pagan), of which this could be said; and during the last twelve hundred years, and holding a Paganized Christianity, she has still been the only city that has reigned (and with what fearful tyranny!) over the kings of the earth; and to clinch the conclusion with the rivet of undeniable demonstration, read the 18th verse of the 13th chapter, "Here is wisdom, Let him that hath understanding, count up the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man; and his number is *six hundred and sixty-six*." For the information of those who have not had their attention drawn to this remarkable passage, I would state, the Greek letters are used as figures or numerals, as well as in writing words; and so it is in the Latin, from which the practice is taken of numbering the chapters in our English Bibles. To illustrate the above passage, we shall suppose a person in company, was speaking of an individual with whose name his audience were unacquainted, but which they much wished to know; and he would say, "I will give you a clue to it. Take Latin numerals that will make 653, and you may find his name;" and they all set to work to make it out, and one of them, more acute than

the rest, writes, "D (500), I (1), L (50), I (1), C (100), I (1)," which added together, make the number of his name, 653, showing that the name required is "Delici." Now, the Apostle wrote in Greek, and he would, of course, use the Greek numerals; and we find that the Greek words, *He Latine Basilica*, (in English, the Latin Kingdom or Empire,) when taken, letter by letter, and the number that each letter stands for put together, they make just 666, "the number of the beast." This was brought out with convincing clearness in the Campbell and Purcel debate. The Archbishop affected to laugh at it, and said, by way of banter, "I can make that number out of Alexander Campbell;" to which Campbell replied, "If you do, I will give up the debate;" and he also challenged the Bishop to show state or empire, that like *He Latine Basilica*, will spell 666.

I would here take notice of the luminous logic of the last sentence of the *Freeman's* editorial upon the Primacy. He says, "Here we leave the question for the present, in the full assurance that our opponent will have either to give up his principle, or what is not very likely, become a firm believer in the Primacy of the successor of Peter." Does not giving up my principles, for which I have been in this controversy contending, and believing in the Pope, mean the same thing? There is no *alternative* here. He says in effect, "He must either give up his Protestantism, or, what is not very likely, become a firm believer in the Pope;" just about as sensible as to say, "He must either eat ham, or, what is not very likely, partake of swine's flesh;" or, "He must either breathe through his nostrils, or, what is not very likely, inhale through his nose." Or, if I should say of Mr. Ferguson, "He must either give up his Popery, or what is not very likely, become a Protestant." Burns speaks of trying once, when tipsy, to count the horns of the moon; but "whether she had *three* or *four*, he *couldna tell*." So, this writer has been so beclouded by the fogs of Infallibility, that he could not see that the dilemma that he had made for me had only *one horn*, and I think that he is himself fairly transfixed upon it; and I shall, for the present, at least, leave him there—rather in a humiliating position for one, whom the Catholics of Toronto, I am informed, look upon as their *ablest* man!

As to the dogma of Infallibility, the Catholics need not find fault now with *Protestants* opposing it. Since *Father* Ferguson mounted the platform at Owen Sound, and boasted of his two hundred and fifty millions, Dr. Dollinger has struck a key-note that is now being taken up by the aroused millions of Catholic Germany, and which is reverberating with appalling power throughout the halls and chambers even of the Vatican!

Let us hear some of the utterances of the great Dr. Dollinger: "As a christian, as a theologian, as a historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine. Not as a christian: for it is irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the plain words of Christ and of the Apostles; it purposes just that establishment of the kingdom of this world, which Christ rejected; it claims that rule over all communities, which Peter forbids to all and to himself. Not as a theologian: for the whole tradition of the Church is in irreconcilable opposition to it. Not as a historian, can I accept it: for as much as I know that the persistent endeavor to realize this theory of a kingdom of the world has cost Europe rivers of blood; has confounded and degraded whole countries; has shaken the beautiful organic

architecture of the elder Church; and has begotten, fed, and sustained the worst abuses in the Church."

It is stated that forty-four of the Professors of Munich University, endorse the words of Dollinger in an address to him; and ask the Infallibilists (*Father Ferguson*, of course, among the number), "Is God in need of your *lie*? and we, and thousands of true hearts with us, answer, like you, reverend sir, with a clear and decided "No!" And this in despite of the infallible "Yes" of Mr. Ferguson's two hundred and fifty millions! The loving, eloquent and renowned Hyacinth, comes with words of power to the support of his illustrious friend, and denounces the Infallibilists as schismatics, who have cut themselves off from the *true Church of Christ*.

Now that these great and good men have grappled with the Papal bugbear, contained in the dogma, "If you doubt, you are damned," which has been so long the strongest bulwark of Romanism, I trust that they will go on and bring all the "interpretations of Catholicity" to the test of Scripture, as well as Infallibility, and they will find that it is not the only *lie* that Popery has palmed upon the world.

Ever since I was old enough to understand the position of the Papacy, and its mighty power for evil that it had exerted against the best interests of mankind, I have watched its history with great interest; and I was greatly pleased at the calling of the OEcumenical Council, as I was satisfied that it would develop the latent antagonistic forces of that wonderful Institution, which had in it, as in its pagan prototype as seen by him of Babylon, in his wondrous dream, the strength of the iron and the weakness of the miry clay; and I felt a strong conviction, not weakened by late events, that the Infallible Dogma, by which the Jesuits sought to bind the conscience of the world, would be cracked and broken, and fall in pieces among the disintegrated units that had been so long bound together by the power of that fatal superstition.

In the Editorial under the caption, "Tristram Shandy Again," Mr. Ferguson charges me with having said in my first letter in reply to him, that I read no book but the Bible, and then accuses me with falsehood because I do read other books. This he said to the Catholics in his Catholic Paper; he would not have dared to say this in the *Times*, in which my letter had appeared. If I had said that I never read any other book, I would have been a liar like unto him.

I may now observe, that I read "Lothair," by the celebrated Disraeli, in which he exposes with such a masterly hand, the deception, dissimulation and the deep-dyed falsehood of the Roman Hierarchy; and my spirit being more than usually stirred up, I wrote the following, with which I shall now close this discussion:

The time now draws near for the Poppedom to tumble,
 For dark is the scowl and fierce is the grumble
 That comes from the men, who have sworn they will humble
 The Pope and the Poppedom, or die!
 All rotten's the Papacy now at the core,
 Tho' bedizened and spangled with jewell'ry o'er—
 The peoples are shouting: Down, down with the w——e,*
 Her doom, long foretold, has come nigh.

*Rev. xvii. 1.

With the blood of the martyrs she long has been drunk;*
 The Priest and Inquisitor, Abbot and monk,
 Must soon all go down in their old rotten junk
 As a mill-stone,† to rise up no more;
 The world will rejoice at the close of the lie,
 That long has been work'd in the face of the sky;
 ‡Swift vengeance will come, as proclaimed from on high—
 And hark to its stern, distant roar!

We don't hate the men—'tis the system we hate,
 That so long has beclouded and darkened the fate—
 Yes, for ages—of many a kingdom and state,
 With its smoke from the bottomless deep!§
 But its power to do evil will shortly be o'er;
 Her merchandise no one will buy any more;
 And vengeance comes down with its terrible score,
 While her merchants all bitterly weep.||

The Catholic nations, once famous and strong,
 Are *crippled and cowed*, and could not prolong—
 Tho' urged by the clergy—the terrible wrong
 Of a Roman Pontifical King;
 His votaries groan at the dreaded exposure
 Of weakness, from bursting the Papal enclosure,
 And taking the sceptre away from the Crozier,
 Despite the Infallible *thing*—

Made so by the Council, before humbled France
 Had taken away each breech-loader and lance,
 No more to defend the Pontifical manse—
 Because they were needed at home.
 No longer defended, Rome had been a prey
 To the "*Party of Progress*;" but stronger than they,
 Emmanuel comes—glad his rule they obey—
 Who has *crushed* the *Priest rulers* of Rome!

In spite of the monstrous Pontifical Bull
 Of hatred and cursing and venom brim full,
 Hurled 'gainst the "*Victor*"—who takes it quite cool,
 And laughs at the old croaking voice!
 And treats with contempt his once terrible roar
 That used so to frighten the nations of yore,
 While the horns of the monster were covered with gore—
 This is passed—let the saints all rejoice!

*Rev. xvii. 6; †xix. 21; ‡xviii. 10; §xix. 3; ||xviii. 11.